Order Number 9204449

Moral perspectives of women administrators of student services in higher education: An exploration of Gilligan's theory

Luce, Jean Marie, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1991

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

MORAL PERSPECTIVES OF WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT SERVICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION: AN EXPLORATION OF GILLIGAN'S THEORY

by

Jean M. Luce

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1991

Approved by

David K. Reelly
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor David B. Kelly

Committee Members Dale A. Brubaker

Harold D. Langston

Rebecca M. Smith

Nina K. Starr

April 2, 1991
Date of Acceptance by Committee

April 2, 1991
Date of Final Oral Examination

LUCE, JEAN M. Ed.D. Moral Perspectives of Women Administrators of Student Services in Higher Education: An Exploration of Gilligan's Theory. (1991) Directed by Dr. David H. Reilly. 137 pp.

This study explores the moral perspectives which senior-level female administrators bring to the administration of student services in private four-year colleges. Gilligan's theory of moral development (1977, 1982) which posits at least two perspectives, one of care and the other justice, was used to frame the research questions. An interpretive method developed by Brown, Argyris, Attanucci, Gilligan, Johnston, et al. (1988) to analyze, interpret, and represent findings was used.

Participants were 16 women employed as senior-level student services administrators in private colleges in six states. Data were collected through personal interviews which were tape recorded and transcribed for data analysis. Participants described two real-life issues which caused inner conflict and responded to a standardized student issue presented as a hypothetical dilemma.

The following research questions were addressed in the analysis: 1) What situations do women administrators of student services in higher education report as causing inner moral conflict? 2) What is the moral language used by women administrators in their description of the resolution of inner moral conflicts? 3) In their resolution of conflict, with which moral perspective do women administrators align?

4) Do women administrators change moral perspective according to the context in which the conflicts occur?

Findings showed that both the care and justice perspectives were present in all 31 narratives of real-life conflict. Neither care (relationships) nor justice (rights) was more fully elaborated in over 60% of the narratives; in those narratives where predominance of perspective was determined, justice was manifested more often than care. The women administrators frequently aligned with and used both justice and care perspectives in resolving real-life conflicts. Alignment with justice occurred only two thirds as often as alignment with care. However, the administrators were more likely to use justice language than care language. Justice was more predominant and more frequently the aligned perspective in the commentaries on the standardized student issue than was the care perspective. Thus, there was an interaction between context and moral perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many have provided support to me on my journey, and particularly to my experience in the doctoral program. To these persons I wish to express my appreciation.

I gratefully acknowledge each member of my committee: David Reilly, chairman, provided the guidance and support I needed throughout the dissertation process; Rebecca Smith shared her expertise about the theory of moral development and trained me in the interpretive method; Hal Snyder, Director of the Asheville Doctoral Program assisted in my initiation into the program and then again in my transition to Greensboro by making a graduate assistantship possible; Dale Brubaker taught the first course I took and his enthusiasm for teaching and learning encouraged me to continue; and Nina Starr continues to provide encouragement through her genuine interest in sharing the results of the study with other students.

I am most appreciative of the women who openly shared their experiences and views with me during the interviews conducted for the study. Special thanks to Pat Bailey and Margi Healy for participation in the pilot study; to the interpretive readers Ginny Lewis, Vivien Radonsky, and Pat Vedder; to Susan Burkholder for helping to transcribe tapes

and to Alice Rice for fine editing assistance.

Among my many supportive friends, those involved in a special way in the "dissertation process" deserve special mention: Wendy Greene, Carole Meshot, Anne Phillips, Marcia Tharp and Priscilla Wallace. I am also grateful to the friends I've met at Friar's, the coffee shop where "everybody knows your name".

I am deeply indebted to close friends in western North Carolina especially the Eaton's who provided vacation opportunities and a real sense of family; the Edell's who provided a place for me to "retreat" and write; the Schneider's who lovingly looked after my home in Asheville; and Julia Black who was only a phone call away.

I gratefully acknowledge members of the various groups at UNC Greensboro, who have given special support: the Office of Residence Life provided a doctoral fellowship, wonderful friendships and generous amounts of flex time to do my writing; St. Mary's House has been a warm church "home away from home"; the Financial Aid Office provided a great summer job experience; and the Department of Educational Administration has been supportive in countless ways since I entered the doctoral program.

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my parents Eleanor and George who felt such great pride in the special accomplishments of their five children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Moral conflicts, not easily resolved by policy manuals, job descriptions, or traditional methods of management, occur on a daily basis for university administrators. These conflicts are frequently portrayed as "forced choices or necessary tensions between incompatible but desirable goals" (Rhodes, 1985, p. 101). Such choices could be, for example, whether to enforce an academic suspension policy or propose an alternative arrangement for a student requesting a 'second chance'; whether to initiate a major change affecting students without their input; or whether to renew a yearly contract with an employee who minimally meets the requirements of the job.

Even when operating within the law, an educational administrator may not be fully convinced that decisions are the fairest within the letter of the law nor the most desirable within the spirit of the law. Knowledge that most decisions will not be scrutinized by boards of trustees nor the public at large, as long as each outcome seems generally "reasonable", tempers the fear that these decisions may not be absolutely fair. Even with a sincere desire to serve the university and dispense whatever benefits and advantages it can legitimately offer to students, there is no certainty

whether the line has been crossed from legality to illegality, equality to favoritism, wisdom to foolishness. Concern for "rightness," "fairness," and "justice" within our institutions has raised critical questions and posed certain dilemmas. Is fairness always the overriding value, or are other values sometimes more appropriate and desirable? Is interconnectedness of human relationships important to university administrators? Can a caring person also be an effective administrator?

Gilligan (1977, 1982) has proposed that there are two different perspectives in moral reasoning; one focusing on care, responsibility, and nurturance in accordance with people's needs; the other on justice stressing rules and principles associated with individual rights. Since 1982, Gilligan and her associates have conducted several studies (Gilligan, Ward, & Taylor, 1988; Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990) to examine and understand further the different perspectives in moral reasoning. The results support the notion that there are at least two different orientations to morality which are not mutually exclusive. These two dimensions of relationship are described as "coordinates for a new map of development" (Gilligan, 1986, p. 37). Studies by Gilligan and her colleagues (Brown, 1989; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Johnston, 1988) also show that individuals use both kinds of considerations in the construction, resolution, and evaluation of real-life moral conflicts, but

one mode is usually dominant. A central assumption underlies their research: "the way people talk about their lives is significant; the language they use and the connections they make reveal the world that they see and in which they act." (Conn, 1989, p. 38)

Purposes of Study

The primary purpose of this study is to understand the moral perspectives that women bring to the resolution of conflicts in the administration of student services in institutions of higher education. The moral development theory, which purports that there are at least two perspectives used in the construction, evaluation, and resolution of moral conflict, will be used to frame and explore the research questions. As an exploratory study, it will delve into some of those "gray areas" which cause inner conflict and confusion for administrators, especially those who take seriously their responsibilities related to the crucial mission of the university. Chickering (1981) said it well when he proclaimed that "every college and university ... is in the business of shaping human lives ... It is one of the fundamental reasons for their existence" (p. 12). A secondary purpose of this study is to enhance the body of research related to Gilligan's theory by addressing a group of subjects not yet included: female administrators in a higher education setting.

Assumptions

A guiding assumption is that discussions of real-life moral conflicts will provide data from which interpretations of moral voice and perspective can be made (Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1988, p. 24). There are at least two moral perspectives--one of justice and rights and one of care and response represented in people's descriptions of moral conflict--which individuals understand and use in resolving moral conflicts (Johnston, 1988, pp. 49-50). The moral perspectives of justice and care are not conceived as dichotomous or opposite; rather as two perspectives on a moral problem that may shift over time (Johnston, 1985). Vulnerability to both oppression and abandonment in relationships is shared by all humans and is an underlying factor in understanding the moral perspectives of justice and care (Brown, Tappan, Gilligan, Miller, and Argyris, 1989, p. 142).

Significance of the Study

The research findings of this study will have relevance to three areas. First, they will contribute to the descriptive research related to the development of Gilligan's theory that there are different perspectives used in the resolution of moral conflict: one of justice and one of care or a combination. These perspectives can be identified through the use of language and an analysis of the moral

decision making in actual narratives of conflict situations told by female administrators. Second, an interpretation of moral conflicts will enhance our understanding of the complex set of issues related to the administration of student services programs and policies in colleges and universities.

Finally, the research may have a major impact in the applied field since data related to resolution of moral conflicts are based on actual situations described by college administrators rather than hypothetical dilemmas. According to Goodchild (1987), most educational studies related to ethics have focused on moral discourse rather than descriptive applications. This study provides actual case study material and suggests ways of viewing these from different moral perspectives. It is hoped that this research will stimulate discussion and also raise important questions for further research by college student services practitioners, as well as students and scholars in the field of higher education.

Research Questions

Four research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What situations do women administrators of Student Services in higher education report as causing moral conflict?
2. What is the moral language used by women administrators in their description of the resolution of conflicts?

3. In their resolution of conflict, with which moral perspective do women administrators align: care or justice or a combination?
4. Do women administrators change moral perspective according to the context in which the conflicts occur?

Definitions

Care Voice: a term used to describe relationships in terms of attachment or detachment, connection or disconnection (Brown, 1989, p. 17).

Care perspective and care orientation (used interchangeably): attention given to problems of detachment or abandonment within an ideal of attention and response to need (Gilligan and Attanucci, 1988, p. 73).

Dean of Students: the initial title designating the manager of the organized extracurricular activities on a college campus (Knock, 1984, p. 38).

Justice Voice: a term used to describe relationships in terms of inequality or equality, reciprocity, or lack of respect (Brown, 1989, p. 17).

Justice perspective and justice orientation (used interchangeably): attention given to problems of inequality and oppression within an ideal of reciprocity and equal respect (Gilligan and Attanucci, 1988, p. 73).

Narrative of conflict and choice: a story told by a narrator (interviewee) sharing an understanding of a par-

ticular conflict experienced in the recent past. (Brown et al., 1988, p. 53)

Narrative self: the narrator's representation of self as a moral protagonist in the story i.e., as a thinking, feeling, acting, moral agent. (Brown, et al., 1988, p. 53)

Student Services and Student Affairs (used interchangeably): the organizational division on a college campus responsible for the out-of-class life of students; the organized extracurriculum.

Limitations

This study was not intended to be generalizable to all senior-level female administrators. Rather, it was designed to explore and describe real-life experiences of moral conflict reported by a select group of women administrators in student services in private four-year colleges. The sample group consisted of 16 volunteer participants employed in private four-year colleges in the southeast region of the United States.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to understand the multiple moral perspectives that women bring to the resolution of moral conflict in the administration of student services in institutions of higher education. This chapter covers three general areas: 1) the theoretical background leading to the premise that there are at least two moral perspectives: one of care and one of justice; 2) the development of the theory and methodology used in the study; and 3) the context for this study--the administration of student services within colleges and universities.

Background

Theories related to gender identity have been closely tied to explanations of basic differences in the ways males and females identify "self" and develop perspectives about relationships and morality. Freud's developmental paradigm is built "around the experiences of the male child that culminate in the Oedipus complex" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 6). In the 1920's, Freud struggled with questions related to female development, which did not easily "fit" the male experience due to obvious differences in anatomy and early family relationships. Freud's theory incorporated female

differences in terms of "envying that which they missed...he considered this difference in women's development to be responsible for what he saw as women's developmental failure" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 7). Freud's theory dominated psychological thought related to gender identity for nearly fifty years.

> Having tied the formation of the superego or conscience to castration anxiety, Freud considered women to be deprived by nature of the impetus for a clear-cut Oedipal resolution. Consequently, women's superego - the heir to Oedipus complex - was compromised: it was never "so inexorable, so impersonal, so independent of its emotional origins as we require it to be in men." From this observation of difference, that "for women the level of what is ethically normal is different from what it is in men," Freud concluded that women "show less sense of justice than men, that they are less ready to submit to the great exigencies of life, that they are more often influenced in their judgments by feelings of affection or hostility". (Gilligan, 1982, p. 7)

Piaget, whose studies of children playing games culminated in a description of two stages of morality: "preschool children through middle childhood viewed justice as obedience to authority while older children took into account the concepts of equality and reciprocity" (Gelwick, 1985, p. 31). In "Piaget's account (1932/65) of the moral development of the child, girls were an aside, a curiosity to whom he devoted four brief entries in an index that omits 'boys' altogether because 'the child' is assumed to be male" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 18). In <u>The Moral Judgment of the Child</u>

(1965), Piaget wrote, "The most superficial observation is sufficient to show that in the main, the legal sense is far less developed in little girls than in boys" (p. 77).

In 1968 Kohlberg revised Piaget's two-stage model into six stages of moral development and examined the validity and sequence of these stages over a 20-year longitudinal study. Kohlberg (1984) described his work as "an effort to replicate Piaget's [1948] description of moral judgment stages, to extend them to adolescence, and to examine the relation of stage growth to opportunities to take the role of others in the social environment" (p. xix).

Kohlberg studied a sample of 84 boys aged 10-16 years, and followed their development at three-year intervals (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). He constructed hypothetical dilemmas which placed values in conflict, i.e., the value of life versus property, obedience versus fidelity, and respect for the individual versus concern for the group. Kohlberg claimed that there were distinct stages in the development of moral reasoning which followed a hierarchical pattern, an invariant sequence, and that these stages were universally present (Colby & Kohlberg, 1984). The concept of justice in terms of conventional morality was central to Kohlberg's six-stage framework.

Beck (1989) summarized Kohlberg's six stages noting that according to Kohlberg, stages one and two were preconventional and usually occurred in children aged 4 to 10, and

stages three and four were conventional, whereas stages five and six were postconventional or principled and occurred only in adulthood (stage six is rarely attained by anyone) (p. 175). Kohlberg's six stages of moral development are the following:

1. Obedience based on avoidance of punishment
2. Individualism, instrumental purpose and exchange
3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships and conformity
4. Social system and conscience
5. Social contract or utility and individual rights
6. Universal ethical principles (Kohlberg, 1989, pp. 72-74)

In addition to his claims for invariant sequence and hierarchy among the stages, Kohlberg (1982) posited, "Individuals are consistent in their stage of moral reasoning regardless of the kind of moral dilemma presented to them, regardless of the moral issue on which a subject must take a stand" (pp. 516-517).

Consideration of the differences in female development were not taken seriously in the early moral development theories, specifically those of Piaget and Kohlberg. Gilligan, who worked with Kohlberg at Harvard where she studied clinical psychology, noticed that although all of the subjects in Kohlberg's studies were male, he generalized the results of his research to both men and women. When measured by Kohlberg's scale, women tended to be exemplified in the third stage, whereas men typically reached stage

four. Thus, women appeared to be deficient in moral development (Gilligan, 1982, p. 18).

More positive views related to female development have recently influenced theorists. For instance, Chodorow (1974) has argued that gender identification results primarily from role differentiation. Since "women, universally, are largely responsible for child care, feminine personality comes to define itself in relation and connection to other people more than masculine personality does" (pp. 43-44). Chodorow (1974), Dinnerstien (1976), and Miller (1976) have each had a major influence on research related to new understandings about gender identity and women's development. The task involved in establishing identity as male or female is quite different for young boys and girls. Boys must learn "to be other" in relationship to their primary caretaker of the opposite sex. For girls the task is to learn to relate to and be independent in an environment where they can imitate and "be like" the adult who is closest to them and of the same sex (Gelwick, 1985).

In her 1982 publication In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development, Gilligan argued that women progress along a path different from that followed by men. Her research was an attempt to understand and describe a developmental path which differs from that which Kohlberg articulated and generalized. Gilligan (1986b) portrayed her

work in terms of "remapping the moral domain" stating her intention to

> discover whether something had been missed by the practice of leaving out girls and women at the theory-building stage of research in developmental psychology -that is, whether Piaget's and Kohlberg's descriptions of moral development, Erikson's description of identity development, Offer's description of adolescent development, Levinson's and Vaillant's descriptions of adult development, ... contained a consistent conceptual and observational bias, reflected in and extended by their choice of all-male research samples. (Gilligan, 1986, p. 325)

The important distinction that Gilligan (1986b) made was that women should not be compared with men based on norms from studies which use all-male samples. She argued that female differences need not be "interpreted as evidence of female deficiency" (1986b, p. 326); rather, these differences point to another perspective. "In defining a shift in perspective that changes the meaning of the key terms of moral discourse--such as the concept of self, the idea of relationship, and the notion of responsibility--I described an ethic of care and response that I contrasted with an ethic of justice and rights" (Gilligan, 1986b, p.326). Gilligan further clarified that "my work focuses on the difference between two moral orientations--a justice and a care perspective rather than on the question of whether women and men differ on Kohlberg's stages of justice reasoning" (1986b, p. 328). It had already been established that

women differed from men in rather significant ways; Gilligan was concerned with understanding how moral development theory could be enhanced by including women's experiences.

Theory of Different Moral Perspectives

Gilligan (1977, 1982) and her associates (Attanucci, 1988; Johnston, 1988; Lyons, 1983) heard and saw different developmental patterns exhibited by males and females of different ages by listening to them describe themselves, their relationships, and their moral choices. Males typically described themselves in terms of their abilities and connections with others through those abilities; they saw others through the self's perspective. A few examples illustrate this. Lyons (1983) cited 14-year-old Jack in an open-ended interview which began with the question: "How would you describe yourself to yourself?"

> What I am? (pause) That's a hard one...Well, I ski -I think I'm a pretty good skier. And basketball, I think I'm a pretty good basketball player. I'm a good runner...and I think I'm pretty smart. My grades are good...I get along with a lot of people, and teachers. I'm not too fussy, I don't think - easy to satisfy, usually - depending on what it is. (p. 128)

Males tended to use rules and principles based on reciprocity in describing difficult choices. When discussing his major consideration in a moral conflict, Jack explained, "Well, you have to think about what would be right...and then...are you gonna stand up for what's right and wrong to

your friends, or are you gonna let them...get you into going." He decided not to go along with his friends, because "I didn't think it was right...and if somebody wanted to wax my windows, I wouldn't like it, so I wasn't going to do that to someone else" (Lyons, 1983, p. 129).

Females, on the other hand, often described themselves in terms of their relationships and their surroundings; they tended to see others in their own terms. The need to seek resolution of moral conflicts for females often arose from "having to maintain connections between people, not wanting people to be isolated, alone, or hurt" (Lyons, 1983, p. 131). Fourteen-year old Amy described herself:

> I like to do a lot of things. I like to do activities and ski and stuff. I like people. I like little kids and babies. And I like older people, too, like grandparents and everything; they're real special and stuff. ...I have a lot of friends in the neighborhood. And I laugh a lot. (Lyons, 1983, p. 128)

When asked to describe a situation in which she was not sure what was the right thing to do, Karen, age 8, answered,

> I have a lot of friends and I can't always play with all of them, so everybody's going to have to take a turn, because they're all my friends. But like if someone's all alone, I'll play with them.

When asked what kinds of things she considered when trying to make such a decision, Karen replied, "Um, someone all alone, loneliness." (Gilligan, 1982, p. 32)

According to Lyons (1983), the distinction between these two different perspectives--the perspective which defines morality in terms of "doing what's right, what one ought to do" (p.126) and the perspective which attempts to work out "the least painful alternative for all the people involved" (p. 133) -- was verified by data from studies which included younger children, adolescents and adults as well (p. 130). Gilligan's initial hypotheses stated

> (1) that there are two distinct modes of moral judgment--justice and care--in the thinking of men and women; 2) that these are gender-related; and (3) that modes of moral judgment might be related to modes of self-definition (Lyons, 1983, p. 127).

Her own studies and others confirmed and refined the "different voice" hypothesis by demonstrating that (1) the justice and care perspectives were distinct orientations that organize people's thinking about moral problems in different ways; (2) boys and men who resemble those most studied by developmental psychologists tend to define and resolve moral problems within the justice framework, although they introduce considerations of care; and (3) the focus on care in moral reasoning, although not characteristic of all women, is characteristically a female phenomenon in the advantaged populations that have been studied (Gilligan, 1986, p. 330).

Although her 1982 publication sold over 360,000 copies, "Gilligan's work has also generated heated debate in a field which it is still thought fairly radical to suggest that women's development might be fundamentally different from men's" (Prose, 1990, p. 25). Criticism of Gilligan's work came from some who perceived that her theory of moral development was nothing new; "this bifurcated view of reality can easily be traced at least to classical Greece, where men were understood to realize themselves best in the public sector, the polis, and women in domesticity" (Kerber, 1986, p. 306). Some argued that Gilligan oversimplified the male/female dualist position by simply changing the rhetoric to "encourage the conclusion that women really are more nurturant than men, less likely to dominate, more likely to negotiate than men", and that she does not take the psychological limitations of women into consideration (Kerber, 1986, p. 307).

Another attack on Gilligan's work centered around her methodology, claiming that her studies needed better sampling techniques, more reliable and objective coding systems, and better utilization of combination rules (Luria, 1986, pp. 316-317). Others (Greeno & Maccoby, 1986) claimed that Gilligan's interpretations were incorrect; they argued that it was education and class rather than gender which accounted for the differences in moral perspective identified in her studies.

A line of criticism, reminiscent of Gilligan's own argument against the studies of Kohlberg's and others, posited that her studies were not inclusive. Stack (1986) cautioned that gender construction was not the same in all societies. Stressing the importance of culture, Stack argued that Gilligan's theory "derives a female model of moral development from the moral reasoning of primarily white, middle-class women in the United States" (p. 324). Finally, there were those who hold that Gilligan's theory lacked philosophical assumptions (Sichel, 1985).

Controversy surrounding the nature of Gilligan and her colleagues' research continues. In practical ways it has helped them clarify and pursue their own questions related to female development, to the understanding of both care and justice perspectives in moral reasoning, to the development of the care perspective, and to their interactive method of inquiry and analysis. The following studies have been selected for review because of their relevance to the exploration of moral perspectives which female administrators of student services bring to the resolution of conflict.

In 1977, Gilligan addressed issues related to the exclusion of women's experiences in the theory-building stage of Kohlberg's moral development theory in her essay titled "In a Different Voice" published in the Harvard Educational Review. She discussed findings from women who spoke in different terms when asked to respond to Kohlberg's

well known hypothetical dilemma. When responding to whether or not a man named Heinz should steal a drug needed for his dying wife, women often sought or supplied further information about the particulars of the situation, rather than applying principles. This type of moral reasoning which focused on protecting relationships or a concern about people getting hurt placed the women at Kohlberg's stage three. Women's approach to solving moral dilemmas appeared to be different from that which used a hierarchy of principles to judge a situation (Kohlberg's highest stages). Gilligan's observation that "women impose a distinctive construction on moral problems, seeing moral dilemmas in terms of conflicting responsibilities" (1977, p. 515) was the initial hypothesis of her research.

> Longitudinal studies of women's moral judgments are necessary... Kohlberg's research on moral development has confounded the variables of age, sex, type of decision, and type of dilemma by presenting a single configuration (the responses of adolescent males to hypothetical dilemmas of conflicting rights) as the basis of universal stage sequence. (Gilligan, 1977, p. 515)

Gilligan not only challenged the theory of moral development posed by Kohlberg, but also questioned the closed methodological system he used for analyzing and representing the data. She and her colleagues saw the necessity to develop an interactive method to explore the hypothesis that there was more than one perspective for moral decision making,

problem solving, and negotiation in relationships. Most of the studies conducted by Gilligan and her colleagues addressed both theoretical and methodological questions.

Several initial studies explored the different moral perspective hypothesis; most engaged the use of both hypothetical dilemmas structured and presented by the researcher and real-life dilemmas framed and narrated by the participants. Of particular interest was a study with a relatively large sample: 144 males and females at nine separate points in the life cycle. Langdale (1983) reported findings: 1) both care and justice appeared in the data and were related to gender; 2) there was more justice exhibited in the considerations of hypothetical dilemmas than in the real-life dilemmas; and 3) in females, there was a positive relationship between the care perspective using an interactive system of analysis (Lyon's coding system) and Kohlberg's stage three using a closed system (p. xiii). When asked a different set of questions, participants, primarily females, revealed a distinct moral orientation that appeared systematically across the life cycle and was previously confused with stage three of a justice orientation (Langdale, p. 245).

Johnston's research with 11-15 year olds (1985) demonstrated that both genders can and do use both systems of reasoning--one of rights and one of response--to solve problems. With a group of 60 adolescents, Johnston posed

dilemmas embedded in two fables and asked participants to present solutions. The researcher asked, "How would you solve this problem?", then "Is there another way to solve the problem?", and finally, "Of all the solutions we discussed, which one is best?" The data presented "spontaneous" and "best" responses. Her findings supported Gilligan's original hypothesis that there are gender differences in moral problem solving; males tended more frequently to use justice as their spontaneous response; and females more frequently to use care as their spontaneous response. Johnston (1988) also noted gender differences in the frequency with which participants shifted orientation.

> Even though boys know both moral orientations, they most often choose and prefer only the rights orientation, while girls choose and prefer both. This finding corroborates Gilligan's original hypothesis that if only males are studied there is a predominant voice of morality, but studying girls complicates a unitary view of morality. It also suggests that girls may learn the dominant voice of morality, that of justice, and be able to represent this...voice, ...but in addition may represent a less well articulated voice of morality and shift voices with greater flexibility than boys. This flexibility may be a strength which is more evident in girls' development than in boys, and it raises the question of whether this is a characteristic of girls in particular or of subordinate groups in general. (p. 61)

Johnston's study also addressed the relationship of context and moral orientation. The two fables elicited a different set of responses; the males had a higher level of care in one than in the other and the females exhibited a

higher level of justice in one fable over the other. Johnston concluded that the differential use of orientation was possibly related to context and the problem solver's view of the relationships involved (1985, pp 72-73).

Gilligan and Attanucci (1988) discussed findings related to use and dominance of moral voice in a study of 80 educationally advantaged adolescents and adults, both males and females. The data supported evidence that individuals tended to prefer either care or justice, even though they can hear both voices. Two thirds of the participants manifested clear dominance of one voice over the other. A relationship of moral voice and gender was evident: care was predominant for a greater percentage of females; justice was predominant for a greater percentage of males.

Ward's research (1988) expanded issues related to context and moral perspective by examining "Urban Adolescents' Conceptions of Violence", a study of 51 adolescents from an alternative high school program with a black, white, and Hispanic population. Participants discussed real-life conflicts involving violence and used both a justice orientation and a care orientation in their considerations. However, a bimodal representation did not adequately capture the complexity of moral perspective. Ward used a methodological framework which included combination categories of "both" and "integrated" to allow possibilities other than strictly a justice or care orientation. (p. 181) The cate-

gory "both" implies that a statement may include both perspectives and that persons can think and use care and justice simultaneously.

Gilligan and several colleagues conducted a five-year study at the Emma Willard School, a private day and boarding school for girls in Troy, New York. Twelve essays containing the results of major portions of that study appear in Making Connections: The Relational Worlds of Adolescent Girls at Emma Willard School (Gilligan, Lyons, & Hamner, 1990). The underlying question guiding the study was formulated by Robert Parker, the former principal, who asked "How can we make intelligent decisions about girls' education without knowing about their psychological development?"

The major finding was that females undergo a crisis between ages 11 and 16 in response to adolescence and to the demands of the culture in such a way that by the time they are 16, they exhibit a loss in confidence and a sense of not knowing what they previously knew (Brown, 1989). The relevance of Brown's thesis was her commitment to "claiming the female voice in interpretation" by attention and sensitivity to the articulation of that perspective in the narratives of girls and women (1989, pp. 20-26). Mindful that girls and women live in a culture established primarily by males, Brown (1989) introduced the metaphor of 'undercurrent' as a means of portraying the complex relationship of women to the culture.

> As Showalter (1985) states, women are neither "inside" nor "outside" of the male tradition, "they are inside two traditions, simultaneously, undercurrents of the mainstream" (p. 264) ...the undercurrent of female voices and visions has been filtered through a dominant androcentric culture... among the voices that have been subordinated or devalued has been a voice that speaks about caring and concern for others and a vision of connection or attachment between people. (p. 20)

The Green River School study (Gilligan, Johnston, & Miller, 1988), a three-year study (1984-1987) involving 90 adolescents, took place in a coed high school setting which allowed issues of gender and context to be explored. That study helped to test and to corroborate findings from earlier studies and was also influential in helping to clarify issues related to interpretive analysis.

During the Green River School Study, the Reading Guide, (Brown, et al., 1988) was developed to represent more adequately the complex interplay of the two voices of justice and care. The method of data analysis was revised so that justice and care would not be dichotomized. The earlier coding system developed by Lyons (1983) was based on a dichotomous framework which resulted in stereotypical responses from some who concluded that care was related to females and the private domain and justice to males and the public domain.

The Green River study supported the findings that care and justice are gender related rather than gender specific.

Analyses of the Green River School data demonstrated how predominance of moral voice changed for the high school sample over the three years. "Predominance cannot be seen as a stable, gender-specific trait, but is better understood as a choice of moral orientation in particular conflicts and in a particular context which changes over time" (Gilligan, Johnston, & Miller, 1988, p. 26). The finding related to predominance of voice is key to this study involving contexts in student services in higher education.

A majority of the studies utilizing the framework of two moral perspectives have involved adolescents. Attanucci (1988) examined how a group of women who were mothers of infants described themselves and their role. The study involved 20 women ages 27-37 years from the Human Infancy Project which operated in the Greater Boston area. Using an open-ended, unstructured approach and focusing the analysis on naturally occurring self descriptions, Attanucci developed a framework for understanding "in whose terms" the self-descriptive statements were made. Her four-category framework assumes that "both self and other can be viewed objectively, in terms of social purposes and roles, and subjectively, in the person's own terms" (1988, p. 202). An important methodological consideration for the current study was articulated by Attanucci: "the need for considering self and role in the context of specific interpersonal relationships and in the woman's own terms " (1988, p. 223).

Questions about how women in various professional roles--e.g., attorneys, physicians--describe and resolve moral issues have been addressed. Jack and Jack (1988) found that female attorneys align with moral perspective in one of three ways: 1) a small percentage emulate the justice model which is central to the law profession; 2) the majority divide their world into two domains--the public work setting where the justice perspective is used and their private life which allows use of the care perspective; or 3) a few reshape their role to integrate use of both perspectives in both public and private settings (pp. 263-288).

Gilligan's theory of moral development has evolved from a recognition that women's experiences were significantly omitted from earlier theories of human and moral development e.g., Freud, Piaget, and Kohlberg. Both the theory and method being developed by Gilligan and her associates are still considered to be in the descriptive stage. There is general agreement that her research has made a significant impact in the area of developmental theory and should be taken quite seriously. Unitary models of development are no longer assumed to be the only correct way to view human behavior.

> Gilligan changes the basic constructs for developmental theory. She shows that women's development parallels men's development, and as a result, developmental theory is expanded. Identity development now includes both individuation and interconnectedness. The moral domain now includes

> both fairness and responsibility and care in relationships. (Gelwick, 1985, p. 33)

Context

The context for this study was student services departments at private colleges and universities. The participants were female Deans or Vice Presidents of Student Services serving undergraduate students. A brief history of the activities and mission traditionally associated with the Dean's Office is included. The history of higher education in the United States is closely related to the expansion of the American Protestant churches. The primary responsibility of the early colonial colleges was "to train students to be religious and moral men" (Knock, 1985, p. 18); this mission was originally carried out by the college president and his faculty. By the end of the 19th century, college presidents began to delegate various tasks related to student conduct and activities outside the classroom to deans of men.

Early deans of men were appointed from the faculty and selected on the basis of their personality and ability to model correct behavior and a prevailing set of Christian values. There were no job descriptions, predecessors, professional preparation programs, or additional financial support provided; the first deans relied solely on their own values, skills, and leadership qualities. In general, these deans were given the authority and responsibility to assist

students in adapting to college life, that task being rooted in a religious orientation to service. (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978, pp. 14-15) Clearer definitions of the dean of men's position began to show up in the notes of annual conferences for deans around 1930:

> that officer ...who undertakes to assist the men students (to) achieve the utmost of which they are individually capable, ... through mobilizing in their behalf all the forces within the University which can be made to serve this end (Appleton et al., 1978, p. 14).

Opportunities for women to participate in higher education expanded during the period between the Civil War and the turn of the century when colleges for women were founded and coeducation was introduced. Prior to this time, higher education was almost exclusively defined as a white male enterprise. By 1900, more than 70 percent of the colleges and universities of the United States were coeducational. Deans of women were appointed to handle the issues related to fears about 19th-century women entering higher education (Barr, Keating, and associates, 1985). According to Barr et al. (1985), life was not easy for these early deans of women; the expectation was that they "deal with all of the conditions that faced women students in a male-dominated culture and ... champion the intellectual and personal ambitions of young women" (pp. 30-31). These women deans were often stereotyped as "grey haired ladies doing routine

chores" and "snooping battle-axes" by their male counterparts. However, their own early writings reflect a motivation to "have a primary and unique responsibility for an entire generation of young women" (Appleton et al., 1978, pp. 15-17).

Developments in the field of psychology during World War I had a significant impact on the field of student services within higher education. The application of psychological principles to industrial employee programs, as well as to the classification system established by the Army, helped set the stage for student personnel programs. In 1919, Walter Dill Scott became president of Northwestern University with the understanding that he would initiate a program to guide students into the "proper field of work", based on his conviction that "the great problem in our nation today is the problem of people" (Appleton et al., 1978, p. 17). The student personnel movement was also influenced by the developing mental health field of the time, behaviorism, the measurement and testing movement, vocational guidance models, and John Dewey's educational philosophy consistent with the soon-to-be-introduced "student personnel point of view". Student services expanded greatly from 1930 to 1960. Graduate programs for professional preparation were established during that time and "by the mid-1960's college student personnel work had achieved identity, if not universal acceptance, as a professional

field" (Knock, 1985, p. 30). The position of Dean of Students evolved to encompass the wide variety of services which had been developed for students during the 1950's to mid-1970's.

Commenting on the diversity of activities and functions within student services, Brown (1985) raised and answered the question, "What then is our common mission?"

> The common mission of the students services profession is being the moral conscience of the campus. That mission is fulfilled by providing services and by creating a climate that facilitates student development, in particular the development of student values ... a complex configuration of how they respond to injustices, how they perceive their career goals, how they interact with other people, what they learn in the classroom, what life-styles they prefer, and what meaning they find in their own lives and in the lives of others. (p. 68)

His answer provided compelling motivation to place an exploratory study involving moral perspectives within the context of student services in higher education. To date, there has been little research concerning moral development theory and its relationship to administrative practice. Gilligan's moral development theory will be used to understand the perspectives which women Deans of Students bring to the position which encompasses the wide variety of responsibilities and roles related to student development on college campuses.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used to examine the moral perspectives that women bring to the resolution of conflict in the administration of student services in institutions of higher education. The method used for interpreting narratives of real-life moral conflict and choice was described in A Guide to Reading Narratives of Conflict and Choice for Self and Moral Voice (Brown, et al., 1988), hereafter called the Reading Guide. The purpose of the Reading Guide is to teach readers to gain understanding of narrative texts by presenting a theoretical framework of moral perspectives and by "using a specific set of referents or meanings defined by this perspective" (p. 33). The Reading Guide is not meant to be a traditional "coding manual" matching interviewer responses to a predetermined set of criteria; rather, "it is designed to teach people to hear moral voice and spot moral orientation" (p. 11).

The method called for reading narratives of conflict at least four times using different lenses to understand the way each conflict was represented and described within a moral framework by the narrator. This methodology is part of a hermeneutic tradition which attempts to "build" interpretation through "circular consideration of both the whole

and its parts" (Brown, Tappan, Gilligan, Miller & Argyris, 1989, p. 144).

> Our Reading Guide offers one way of operationalizing, in a systematic and deliberate manner, the paradoxical hermeneutic circle. ... the method involves "building" an interpretation of a whole interview narrative out of its constituent parts. ...understanding those parts is not possible without some understanding of the whole narrative. Thus the interpretive procedure is a fundamentally circular one, because while the whole can only be understood in terms of its parts, by the same token the parts only acquire their proper meaning within the context of the whole. (p. 144)

Research Sample

A sample of 16 senior-level female administrators of student services at four-year private colleges were interviewed. One criterion was that administrators be employed full-time in a position with the title or its equivalent of Vice President for Student Development, Dean of Students, or Dean of Women. Each administrator was also required to have at least one year of experience working in a student services position at a private four-year college or university. At the time of the interviews, 13 administrators were employed full-time in positions having the title Dean (of Students, Student Life, Student Development, Student Services, or Women); three were Vice President (for either Student Development or Student Affairs). Each administrator had worked at least four years in an administrative capacity in student services in a college or university.

A majority (12) of administrators in this study were identified in the 1989-90 NASPA Membership Directory (National Association of Student Personnel Association). Selected members (4) of NAWDAC (National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors), who attended the 1990 Annual Meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee were also invited to participate. All participants were personally contacted by the researcher who identified herself and stated the general purpose of the study.

All administrators who met the criteria and agreed to participate in the study were interviewed. Data for this study were collected during the Spring of 1990. Four of the 16 interviews were conducted in Nashville, Tennessee, at the 1990 Annual Meeting of NAWDAC; the remaining 12 interviews were held in the office of each participant on her college campus. Those colleges represented in the study were located in six states: North Carolina (10), Georgia (1), South Carolina (1), Tennessee (1), Virginia (2), and Kentucky (1).

Instrument and Procedures

Prior to the interview, each person was asked to sign an Informed Consent form (Appendix A) and immediately following the interview to complete a Personal Data Sheet (Appendix B). An open-ended interview adapted from the "Real-Life Moral Conflict and Choice Interview" (Brown, et

al., 1988, p. 161) was used. This Interview Format (Appendix C) focused on a description of situations presented as causing inner conflict for the participant. Each administrator was asked to describe at least two work-related situations in which she had experienced inner conflict in deciding what to do. Each was asked to elaborate on the context and characteristics of each conflict, and to explain if and how it was resolved. In addition, each person was asked to respond to a standardized student issue, known by all the participants (Appendix C). In all, 15 persons described inner conflict experienced in dealing with three situations. Due to time limitations, one participant described only one conflict situation. Interviews were open-ended and lasted approximately one hour. All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

The interview format was tested in a pilot study with two female student services administrators at the campus of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The primary purpose of the pilot study was to refine the interview format for student services administrators in higher education. The results of the data from the pilot study are included in the analysis.

Data Analysis

An interpretive method of analysis described in the Reading Guide (Brown, et al., 1988) was used to code and

identify the moral language and perspectives used by the subjects in their description and resolution of work-related conflicts. Gilligan, Brown and Rogers (1988) compared the process of reading for self and moral voice to "a process of ear training" ... similar to "learning to distinguish the oboe from the clarinet" in an orchestral piece (p. 14). The first step of the analysis was to locate the story of real-life conflict within the interview text and then to read the story four different ways. A different theme or perspective was listened to during each of the four readings: (a) a sense of the story as told by the narrator, (b) the "self" of the person who is telling the story and who also appears as a central actor in the moral conflict, (c) the moral voice for care, and (d) the moral voice for justice. (Brown, Ed., 1988, pp. 16-17) Colored markers were used to identify passages--a different color for "self", for care and for justice. This process allowed the reader to become attuned to both listening for and seeing the complexity of each narrative "without losing sight of the larger story or the way these voices are orchestrated to convey the conflict" (Brown, et al., 1988, p. 17). The differentiation between the care voice and the justice voice was evident from the blue and red underlining and, more importantly, showed when care and justice were both used at one time. The green underlining ultimately showed which moral voice was aligned with the "self."

Four worksheets (Appendix D) adapted from those suggested in the Reading Guide (Brown, et al., 1988, pp. 162- 173) were completed by the researcher for each of the 31 real-life narratives and the 15 commentaries on the standardized student issue. After reading a particular narrative, the researcher cited words, phrases, or sentences from the narrative which lent themselves to making certain inferences while using the particular lens for that reading, i.e., overall story, self, care, or justice. A summary interpretation based on the notes and evidence gathered was made at the end of each of the four worksheets.

The final worksheet "Summary Coding Questions" (Appendix E) presented a way to represent a categorical typology by making judgments about three dimensions: PRESENCE - how the two moral perspectives were represented in the narrative (1 = Both Justice and Care, 2 = Care only, 3 = Justice only, 4 = uncodable); PREDOMINANCE - which voice was most salient or fully elaborated (1 = Justice, 2 = Care, 3 = Neither predominates); and ALIGNMENT - whether the narrator expressed or implicitly showed a preference for a moral perspective (1 = self aligns with Justice, 2 = self aligns with Care, 3 = self aligns with Both, 4 = self does not express alignment with either). Each narrative received a one-digit code for each of the three dimensions. An overall NARRATIVE TYPE is a three-digit code composed of the individual codes for presence, predominance, and alignment.

For instance, a PRESENCE of Care, a PREDOMINANCE of Neither Care nor Justice, and an ALIGNMENT with Care would be a 2-3-2 narrative type. Authors of the Reading Guide stressed that "narrative types" are not the only way to move from the worksheets to a representation of the data, "but they do provide a useful way to generate and explore interesting hypotheses regarding the ways in which self and moral voice are manifest in narratives of conflict and choice" (Brown, et al., 1988, p. 144).

Reliability and Validity

Gilligan and a community of co-investigators at the Center for the Study of Gender, Education and Human Development at Harvard University School of Education developed the interpretive method of inquiry over a period of 8-10 years during which time they have addressed issues related to reliability and validity. Reliability in this methodology means "the ability of two or more different interpreters to agree on their interpretation and understanding...it assumes that, within acceptable limits, both are reading the text in the same way, or interpreting the same text" (Brown, et al., 1988, p. 145).

Two different ways for determining interpretive agreement were used. The first was more general in terms of considering the degree to which both readers underlined the same parts of the narrative for self, justice, and care and

the degree to which both readers expressed a similar overall interpretation of the narrative as they discussed their summaries of that narrative in conference. The second way to determine interpretive agreement was based on the Narrative Typology described above. The numerical representations of "Presence", "Predominance" and "Alignment" allowed for more "traditional inter-judge reliability assessments" (Brown, et al., 1988, p. 146).

A group consisting of one expert and two trained readers participated with the researcher in establishing interpretive agreement in this study. The two trained readers, as well as the researcher, had completed a 15-week seminar, taught and supervised by the expert on using the interpretive method for reading narratives of conflict and choice. To determine reliability, all four readers read five interviews (randomly selected by the researcher) according to the method described. One of the randomly selected interviews did not include the final standardized issue for discussion. Each reader completed worksheets and Summary Coding Questions for a total of 14 narratives (4 interviews X 3 issues plus 1 interview X 2 issues = 14 narratives). Simple percentage agreement among the four readers was established by comparing the coding on 3 dimensions ("Presence", "Predominance", and "Alignment") for each narrative before discussion and again after discussion.

Overall agreement before discussion was 76.7%; after discussion overall agreement was 91% (Table 1).

Table 1

Intercoder Reliability: Percentage of Agreement Before and After Discussion

	MORAL VOICE					
	PRESENCE		PREDOMINANCE		ALIGNMENT	
CASE	BEFORE	AFTER	BEFORE	AFTER	BEFORE	AFTER
1a	100	100	50	100	50	100
1b	75	75	75	75	75	75
1c	50	75	75	75	100	100
2a	100	100	50	100	50	75
2b	100	100	50	100	50	100
2c	100	100	75	75	75	75
3a	100	100	50	75	50	75
3b	100	100	50	100	50	100
3c	100	100	100	100	100	100
4a	100	100	75	100	50	100
4b	100	100	75	75	50	50
4c	100	100	100	100	75	100
5a	100	100	50	75	50	75
5b	100	100	100	100	100	100
MEAN	94.6%	96.4%	69.6%	89.3%	66%	87.5%

OVERALL PERCENTAGE OF AGREEMENT

BEFORE discussion	76.7%
AFTER discussion	91.0%

The highest percentage of agreement among the four interpretive readers was recorded for "Presence". There was 94.6% agreement before discussion; 96.4% after discussion. The 69.6% agreement figure on the dimension of "Predominance" (which addresses the voice most fully elaborated in a particular narrative) was adjusted to 89.3% after discussion. Interpretive readers had most difficulty establishing agreement in relation to "Alignment", the dimension which indicated whether the narrator showed preference for either the care or justice perspective in each particular narrative. The initial percentage of agreement figure for "Alignment" was 66%; after discussion, readers established 87.5% final agreement. These figures compare favorably to a set of reliability figures for 14 narratives provided in the Reading Guide (p. 158).

Traditional terms and categories associated with validity measures and corresponding generalizations are difficult to use with this interpretive method. "The information that this method yields...is focused on the construction of a particular interpretation of a narrative...built on the reader's view of how self and the two moral voices are represented." (Brown, Ed., 1988, p. 160) Returning to the image of the "hermeneutic circle" to explore issues related to validity of interpreting narratives of conflict using this method, Brown, et al., (1989) found the work of Ricoeur (1979 to have been most helpful. Arguing for the

necessity of a dialectic between Verstehen ("guessing") and Erklaren ("validation"), Ricoeur described a circular process leading to "an interpretation (which) must not only be probable, but more probable than another" (1979, p. 91).

This study followed the recommendation that at least two readers read each narrative and discuss their differences in interpretation in order to "reconcile them in terms of a new interpretation " (Brown, et al., 1989, p. 162). One of the trained readers, who participated in the process for establishing reliability, and the researcher read the remaining 34 narratives and completed a coding sheet for each for an agreement of 86.3%.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study is an exploration of the moral perspectives which senior-level female administrators bring to the administration of student services in private four-year colleges. Gilligan's theory of moral development (1982, 1988) which claims that there are at least two perspectives, one of care and the other justice, which persons use in the construction, evaluation, and resolution of moral conflict, was used to frame the research questions. An interpretive method developed by Brown, et al. (1988) to analyze, interpret, and represent findings was used.

This chapter presents a demographic profile of the 16 participants and an analysis of the data obtained from interviews with senior-level female administrators. Each described work-related situations of moral conflict and also discussed a standardized student issue presented by the researcher as a hypothetical dilemma. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed to better understand context, moral language, moral perspective, and the relationship between context and moral perspective.

Demographic Profile of Participants

There were 13 White and three African-American women who participated in the study. A majority (9) of the par-

ticipants were under 40 years old; four were in their 40s and three were over 50. Nine had completed a master's degree (two of these were currently enrolled in doctoral programs); six had completed their doctorate and one had a bachelor's degree. The sample group consisted of seasoned administrators; all but two had worked ten or more years in higher education; three had over 20 years' experience; and the majority (11) had from 11-20 years experience in higher education. Thirteen were Deans and three were Vice Presidents; the majority (11) had worked in their current positions for less than six years. All represented student services in four-year colleges located in six states; Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. There were three women's colleges and 13 coeducational; all were private institutions; 13 colleges enrolled fewer than 2,000 students; three had over 2,000. Due to the confidential nature of the situations discussed, the names of the colleges were not included (see Table 2).

Context of Moral Conflict

The answer to the question, " What kinds of situations do women administrators of student services in higher education report as causing moral conflict?", was that it was most often in those situations that the women administrators exercised their role as judicial officer or supervisor.

Table 2

Demographic Profile of Participants

Age	Number	Percentage
Under 30	1	6.25
30-39	8	50.00
40-49	4	25.00
Over 50	3	18.75
Ethnicity		
Black	3	18.75
White	13	81.25
Highest Degree Earned		
Bachelor	1	6.25
Master	9	56.25
Doctor	6	37.50
Experience in Higher Education		
4-10 years	2	12.50
11-20 years	11	68.75
Over 20 years	3	18.75
# of Colleges Where Employed		
1-2	5	31.25
3-6	9	56.25
7-10	2	12.50
Job title		
Dean	13	81.25
Vice President	3	18.75
Years in Current Position		
1-3 years	7	43.75
4-6 years	4	25.00
7-10 years	2	12.50
Over 10	3	18.75
Type of Institution		
Coeducational	13	81.25
Single Sex	3	18.75
# Students at Present College		
Under 600	2	12.50
600-1300	7	43.75
1300-2000	4	25.00
Over 2000	3	18.75

This study did not focus on a particular kind of problematic situation; it was left up to the participants to choose any work-related situation which caused them to experience inner conflict. Because their job title and responsibilities were so directly related to students, the interviewer encouraged each participant to include at least one narrative which involved students. The interviewer stated the request: "I'd like you to talk about a time when you faced a situation on your job when you weren't sure what to do". Ten of the 16 participants spontaneously chose a situation which involved students.

Thirty-one real-life narratives were presented by the 16 participants. Gilligan, Johnston, and Miller (1988) suggested there are three aspects of each real-life dilemma as it unfolds: the "conflict", the "context" and the "content." The inner conflict is the problem as the narrator presented it in her own words, e.g., "I had to give in or I had to lose my job." Context is the framework for the conflict and most frequently involved the relationships and roles described by the narrator. Content is what was considered most at stake or at risk for the narrator in the conflict situation.

A first step in the analysis was to examine the role played by the narrator and the relationships she described. As she presented stories of conflict, each narrator described the context of the situation; people in relation to

herself and one another, and issues which emerged for herself and the others. As the central protagonist, the narrator chose aspects which supported her own perspective or view of each situation. The interviewer's job was to listen carefully and ask for elaboration to help clarify the facts of the story and gain an understanding about how the narrator framed the conflict and described her own thoughts, feelings, and values in the process. Therefore, to uncover the meaning of the story, it was necessary to examine its context, which included the cast of characters with whom the narrator related and the roles she performed. This was done for each narrative during the first reading to gain an overall sense of the story as told by the narrator.

The situations involved either students, colleagues, employees, administrators, "others," or a combination. Within each situation described, participants functioned in their various roles as judicial officer, educator/advocate, supervisor, or "other." Table 3 summarizes the relationships and roles as the context of each narrative. The contexts most often involved students, especially in situations where the administrator was performing in her judicial role. When the problem was with an employee, she was in a supervisory role. Many narratives involved three or more people, for example, student, parent, and administrator. Therefore, the total count for each category of relationships exceeded the number of narratives (see Table 3).

Table 3

Context: Relationships and Roles

DEANS IN RELATIONSHIP WITH:		PERFORMING IN ROLE AS: Judicial Officer, Educator/Advocate, Supervisor, Other			
		J	E	S	O
1a	Students, Administration		x		
b	Students, Colleague, Adminis.	x			
2a	Students	x			
b	Students	x			
3a	Employee (female)			x	
b	Student, Parents	x			
4a	Students	x			
b	Students, Police	x			
5a	Employee (male)			x	
6a	Student	x			
b	Administration		x		
7a	Students, Colleague (male)		x		
b	Colleague (female)				x
8a	Employees			x	
b	Student, Parent	x			
9a	Student, Parent	x			
b	Employee (male)			x	
10a	Student	x			
b	Colleagues, Parent				x
11a	Student, Adminis., Alumna				x
b	Students, Colleague (male)	x			
12a	Colleague (female)		x		
b	Students, Administration				x
13a	Employee			x	
b	Student	x			
14a	Colleague (male)				x
b	Student, Security Guard				x
15a	Students	x			
b	Student, Parents	x			
16a	Student, Colleagues				x
b	Employee (female student)			x	
TOTALS		14	4	6	7

Students	21
Colleagues	8
Employees	6
Administration	5
Other	8

Student-related Conflicts

Twenty-one narratives directly involved students. The interviewer prompted each participant to include at least one story involving a student or group of students; seven narrators presented two student-related conflicts. In two-thirds of those situations involving students (14 of 21), participants were primarily exercising their role as judicial officer. Student-related conflicts which involved participants in their roles as educator/advocate, supervisor, policy maker, and counselor did not appear as frequently in the narratives of real-life conflict.

A summary of the judicial cases involving students included three multiple-policy violations, two visitation violations, two alcohol violations, two instances of date rape, two on-campus fights, two pranks, and separate instances of stealing and lying. Situations involving participants in their role as judicial officer were most frequently cited as those which caused inner conflict. Stories describing relationships with students in some kind of trouble accounted for over half the narratives in this study.

Colleague-related Conflicts

Eight narratives involved situations in which participants experienced inner conflict in relation to a colleague; three happened with a colleague only and five with colleagues and others. More intense feelings of emotion

were expressed in the descriptions of conflicts with colleagues than in any of the other categories. The following is a sample of emotionally charged statements:

> He said, "charge them all; have they got $1000 to pay for this?" And I said, "that's bullshit, I'm not going to do that."
>
> I was feeling okay. But when these sorts of games would start to happen, I wouldn't be okay and it was very difficult to deal with... suddenly I realized that I had to learn that I was swimming basically with sharks...it was just awful.
>
> It was very hard for me. It was just awful. He blasted me personally... I never lost more sleep trying to get that letter figured out, figuring out how to address the issues he had brought up.
>
> We had a shouting match on the phone and the next thing I get a summons to the President's office. She had gone to the President about my not being cooperative.

Employee-related Conflicts

Six participants described conflict situations in which they were primarily involved with one or more employees in a supervisory relationship. In four of these, the major decision concerned whether or not to renew the employee's contract (two involving a female employee and two a male employee). In the other two instances, the employees were not meeting the expectations of the narrator, who in turn struggled with deciding what to do in response. Decisions related to evaluation and termination of employees were reported among the toughest for this group of administrators to handle. As one so aptly stated,

> Personnel decisions just kind of jump out... we've got to make some pretty hard calls on some of these. Staff terminations are a pretty agonizing experience for me even when I know the person just can't be reached.

Administration-related Conflicts

Five narratives included situations of conflict with those in higher positions than the narrator. One was with a direct supervisor; the other four involved the president. None of these narratives was current; four out of five happened with persons to whom the narrator no longer reported. In three narratives, the narrators discussed experiences in positions they no longer occupied. It was inferred that administrators chose not to share situations of conflict with their current president or immediate supervisor. Those who did share stories from the past remembered in vivid detail their conflicts with those in authority.

Conflicts Involving Parents and Others

Eight narratives involved persons other than students, employees, colleagues, or administration. Five of these were parents; three others were law enforcement agents, an alumna, and a security guard. In seven of the eight situations involving others, students were also involved. Parents were clearly the off-campus group most frequently cited in the conflicts described by the participants.

In the 31 real-life conflicts, the participants most often described their roles as judicial officer (14) and as

supervisor (6), both of which presented situations where the narrator was in a position of power over someone or others. The framework for these relationships was that of inequality.

External and Inner Conflict

These narratives described conflict on two levels: external conflict and inner conflict. Two definitions of conflict given in the New World Dictionary include 1) "a fight, struggle, sharp disagreement or opposition of interests, ideas, etc.; and 2) an emotional state characterized by indecision, restlessness, uncertainty and tension arising from incompatible inner needs." Most narratives in this study spoke about conflict both as an external struggle between individuals or groups and as an inner emotional state experienced by the narrator. The first definition describes the external conflict or the context; the external conflict sparked the inner conflict.

The conversations about real-life conflict began when the interviewer said, "I'd like you to talk about two conflicts which you've experienced in your job as Dean of Students." When participants asked for clarification with questions like, "What do you mean by conflict?", the interviewer responded, "a tough situation which caused you to struggle within yourself about what to do." This was enough direction for the participant to begin talking and to continue with very few interruptions by the interviewer.

Each narrative began with a description of a situation which involved some kind of struggle, confrontation, or disagreement experienced by the dean on her job. These gave the interviewer a first level of understanding the external conflict--the who, what, where, why, etc. To get to the second level of understanding about how the experience caused "inner" conflict, the interviewer asked, "Why was this a conflict for you?"

Sometimes the conflict was stated, yet the full meaning was not immediately apparent. One dean began to talk about how important it was "to be supportive of other areas of the institution even if you don't feel that way". She mentioned that a family member worked at the same campus as she. Then she described an incident in which a visitor was seriously injured by an accident on campus; subsequently, the college was threatened by a potential lawsuit. She did not go into detail about the lawsuit, except to say that it may have some positive effects in terms of helping the various departments gain greater understanding of their priorities. She felt that her own staff had responded well when the accident happened and wondered whether another department should have allowed the area on campus where the accident happened "to be in that kind of shape." An earlier statement then took on fuller meaning. "Having [a family member] in that department sometimes has been a great advantage because it's helped me understand its point of view... yet

sometimes it's really a disadvantage and I wish [that person] worked someplace else." With the possibility of a lawsuit and questions raised about who was at fault, the inner conflict for the dean, whose relative worked for the liable department, became clearer.

Moral Conflict

This study proposed to examine the moral perspectives women bring to the resolution of conflict. Therefore, the interviewer asked each participant if she considered the situations described to be moral conflicts. Eleven of the 16 participants assented, agreeing that these were definitely moral problems and involved moral decisions. Four said the conflicts were more ethical than moral, yet were unable to explain the exact difference between ethical and moral. The interviewer asked one, "Sometimes people use those words interchangeably, but you seem to make a distinction." "They are interchangeable I guess, but he got so legalistic with me that I turned to ethics." Only one hesitated in her response concerning whether these were moral conflicts. She said, "I try not to be judgmental." No one asked the interviewer to clarify the meaning of moral conflict.

What makes something moral? The moral domain encompasses participants' considerations of what is right and wrong, one's motives, concerns for oneself and others, values, principles, what is best and highest in human be-

havior. The dean, whose relative worked in another department that may have overlooked a safety hazard on campus, described the moral aspect of the conflict for her.

> if we're going to talk about safety, me having the knowledge that there's an area on campus that could be a safety hazard. If you have that knowledge, you have a responsibility to share that. The other thing is that somehow we need to sit down and work that through.

The second reading of these narratives by the interpretive readers was directed toward gaining an understanding of the "self". Readers were trained to look for "certain signs or referents of self and moral voice ... sometimes reflecting on an action--sometimes rejecting certain actions." (Brown at al., 1988, p. 53). Action language with "I" as the subject was underlined. Readers paid special attention to choices made by the narrator herself; to what she described herself as saying or doing; to the self in relationship; and finally to what was most at stake for the self in the situation of conflict. When the interviewer asked the question, "what was most at stake for you in this conflict?", the participant would most often focus on the underlying central issue or concern to herself.

Table 4 summarizes the <u>conflicts</u> stated from the point of view of the narrator, as she described and defined both recognized that a description of the context only does not

Table 4

Synopses of the External and Inner Conflicts Reported

EXTERNAL CONFLICT	INNER CONFLICT
President did not allow dean to address students' concerns related to homosexuality; just pretended it didn't exist.	"I was being turned into someone who was not their advocate but rather their adversary."
President stood up for a coach who blatantly violated college policies.	Dean's authority denied; "no one backed me".
Dean heard date rape case involving two students who both felt betrayed by her.	Role as advocate for both students seemed like an impossible task.
Dean heard case involving two female students making threats and accusations to one another.	Desire to remain non-judgmental and objective and feeling "swayed" by certain information.
New Dean fired long-term employee.	"Between the humanistic side that wants to take care of people and the administrative side that knows you've got a job to do."
Students found guilty of honor code violation; collective upset among students/parents over strict interpretation.	How to uphold the college's honor code and support the students at the same time.
Group of students violated alcohol/visitation policies.	"I like to be the good guy...I hate being the bad guy."
Two students were caught with evidence of making fake ID's.	Having to determine level of students' involvement.

Table 4 (cont'd)

External Conflict	Inner Conflict
Employee of the dean attempted to undermine her reputation.	"my health... and how effective can you be?"
Dean sanctioned student for alcohol violation; student protested decision.	The reputation of the program ("sort of my pet baby") would be ruined.
V. President ordered dean to discontinue distributing sex education books to students.	Job at stake; must find other ways to provide sex education to students.
Dean and colleague disagreed about how students' prank should be handled.	Positive working relationship with colleague was threatened.
Dean of Students and Dean of Academic Affairs were divided on several issues.	"it was continuing job satisfaction; there was a lot of mental energy going into this conflict."
Newly appointed dean wanted staff to adjust to her work style.	"A complete change would be unhealthy, but I also knew there were things that were not tolerable to me."
Mother of a student who had been sanctioned decided to disregard the sanction.	Challenge to dean's authority. "then we had lost a grip on everything that is important".
Dean reconsidered a suspension decision after student's mother explained home circumstances.	Concern about fairness and consistency as well as consideration of special circumstances.
Dean decided to fire employee who was not doing a good job.	Concern about person and concern about the program.
Dean suspended student one week before end of the semester.	Concern about "devastating" effects on parents.

Table 4 (cont'd)

External Conflict	Inner Conflict
Conflict between departments due to different priorities exemplified when potential lawsuit is threatened.	Working on the same campus where a close family member also works in another department.
Unstable student, assigned to edit college publication, alienated everyone involved and went overbudget.	Concerns about getting project under responsible control and "my personal liability if this student commits suicide".
Colleague publicly accused dean of biasing the judicial process.	"So that becomes the issue; is the Dean of Students chilling academic freedom?"
Colleague undermined dean's efforts to plan program for freshman orientation.	Preferred cooperation to confrontation. Felt like I was "swimming with sharks".
Dean told to change student judicial system during summer when few students were around.	"Taking that risk with students...knowing that I had to do it".
Employee's job performance does not meet dean's expectations.	Strong desire to "salvage the dignity of the person".
Student was suspended for harassment of another student; mother tried to intervene.	Concern for safety of student body and concern for a student with need for counseling.
Faculty member publicly criticized Dean's Office in student newspaper.	A need to separate strong feelings before public response to criticism.
Dean made error in judgment about a student who overdosed.	Fear of losing job and embarrassment over mistake.

Table 4 (cont'd)

External Conflict	Inner Conflict
Dean heard date rape case involving two students, one of whom was related to her secretary.	Desire to remain unbiased; surprised by some personal bias felt during the hearing.
Dean decided to reveal confidential information about a student to her parents.	Risking possible violation of Family Rights and Privacy Act, as well as rejection by student and her family.
Dean participated in a team intervention with a student who had an alcohol problem.	"Going out on a couple of limbs" for a student by bending rules and possibly upsetting the president.
Dean decided not to renew contract with student employee working as Resident Assistant.	Concern for the needs of employee and needs of other students; feeling responsible for "mismatch".

adequately describe the personal inner conflict; this is described more fully below and analyzed for moral language.

Table 5 is a summary of how each person defined the central issue in her own words. Some aspect of "self" was always the issue, whether it was one's sense of self or one's relationship to other(s), which was threatened. In 17 narratives, a sense of oneself was reported as threatened; in eight, the dean's relationship with students was at stake; in three, her relationship with another (a colleague, employee, or parents) was threatened; and in three, the inner conflict had to do with some aspect of the college being threatened.

In summary, the kinds of situations described by senior-level administrators in this study often involved students, but not always. Two thirds (20 of 31) of the narratives described the participants acting in a role in which they exercised legitimate positional power over others; either as judicial officer or supervisor. In the remaining narratives (11), participants exercised referent or expert power or influence. Some aspect of "self" was always described as being at risk, whether it was personal or in relationship to students or in relationship with others or as a threat to the institution or program.

Table 5

Content: Deans' Principal Concern and Locus of Threat

A. Threat to oneself
B. Threat to relationship with students
C. Threat to relationship with others
D. Threat to institution

	WHAT WAS AT STAKE FOR YOU?	A	B	C	D
1a	Being turned into their adversary.		x		
1b	I didn't believe in the policy.				x
2a	The trust of the other students.		x		
2b	My judging them surprised me.	x			
3a	My job was at stake.	x			
3b	The credibility of the students.		x		
4a	My good name among students.		x		
4b	Health and welfare of residents.		x		
5a	My health and how effective can I be?	x			
6a	Damage the reputation of the house.				x
6b	It was either me or the book.	x			
7a	I needed to restore the relationship.			x	
7b	It was continuing job satisfaction.	x			
8a	My reputation was most important.	x			
8b	The challenge to my authority.	x			
9a	My credibility as one who is fair.	x			
9b	Having to give up my own time.	x			
10a	More at risk for the institution.				x
10b	Makes me liable and is a big risk.	x			
11a	The liability becomes central.	x			
11b	Interrupting my due process.	x			
12a	Success of our Freshmen.		x		
12b	Taking that risk with students.		x		
13a	Salvage the dignity of person.			x	
13b	It was a health risk to students.		x		
14a	Embarassment...so doggone public.	x			
14b	New job and I made a mistake.	x			
15a	Trying not to pass judgment.	x			
15b	Getting parents to understand.			x	
16a	Maybe our pride.	x			
16b	Making that kind of mistake.	x			
	TOTALS	17	8	3	3

Moral Language and Inner Conflict

The analysis of the data for the second question, "What is the moral language used by senior-level administrators in their description of the resolution of conflict?" revealed a definite use of more than one moral voice.

To examine the language used by participants, readers were trained to listen for the voices of justice and care embedded in the narratives of real-life conflict. Each of the 31 narratives was read by at least two trained readers using the interpretive method outlined in the Reading Guide. Each was read four times using different-colored markers to underline significant passages related to a particular focus: 1) overview of the story, 2) the self, 3) care, and 4) justice. A Summary Coding Questions sheet (Appendix E) was completed for each narrative. "Presence", "Predominance", and "Alignment", concepts selected and described by the authors of the Reading Guide (Brown et al, 1988), were used to represent the way in which self and moral voice were manifested and articulated in each narrative (p. 142).

All of the narratives contained moral language and were able to be coded for moral perspective. The moral language used by participants was reported by examining the "presence" and "predominance" dimensions agreed upon and recorded by the interpretive readers. The answers to the question, "Do you consider the situations you described as moral problems?" led into asking the participants "What does

morality mean to you?" How the participants actually defined morality was explored in order to examine the various ways that moral voice was made manifest through language.

Presence of Moral Voice

The process of the interpretive approach used in this study was to examine the entire narrative or set of narratives presented by an individual and then to focus on various parts, remembering that "presence" refers to the articulation of moral voice by the narrator. The interpretive readers determined whether 1) "Both" care and justice were present; 2) "Care" only was present; 3) "Justice" only was present; or 4) "Neither" care nor justice was present in the narrative.

The part of the interview in which each participant was asked to explain what morality meant to her followed her descriptions of two work-related situations which caused inner conflict. Narrators therefore spoke about morality in relation to their discussion of these specific moral conflicts. A voice of justice or rights which highlights issues or decisions in relation to conflicting rights or claims between self and others was "present" in all 31 narratives of real-life conflict. Likewise, a voice of care or response which focuses on maintaining relationships or promoting the welfare of others by preventing harm or relieving their burdens or suffering was also present in all 31 real-life narratives. The following statements were

taken directly from responses to the question "What do you mean by morality?"

Statements which articulate a morality of Care:

> Allowing people to be and accepting them for where they are, for what they do, and loving them as a creation of God and also being there to guide them.
>
> For us, it is recognizing the individuals involved continually and emphasizing that individuals are more important than collective institutions.
>
> I feel strongly that relationships are very important and building relationships, nurturing relationships, whether that be family or others.

Statements which articulate a morality of Justice:

> Morals has to do with sticking to principles for me; it especially has to do with not establishing rules that are superfluous anyway but that look good on the books.
>
> The honor code to me is the overriding morality of this college; always respecting the rights and protecting the rights of the individual, knowing there are certain behaviors that are just not acceptable... A strict code of honor, which to me is morality.
>
> I guess one of them is fair play, not that everything is going to be fair but the intent to try and be fair based on trying to treat people equally.

Statements of morality which combine voices of Care and Justice:

> Am I being fair to students when I know I could get someone better; no harm is done, but not enough good is being done? It's a moral dilemma.

> Morality means doing what is right and good and fair without regard to people or their circumstances, but also with regard to people and their circumstances because sometimes you have to be different.
>
> Moral in having to deal with hearing in detail about somebody's sexual contact, which is probably the most personal part of anybody's life. And you can't pass judgment or try to not pass judgment.

Eight of 16 who narrated stories of conflict from their own life and work connected morality with religion in some way. The moral language reflected justice and care perspectives which had been influenced by Christian beliefs. The interviewer did not ask questions about the religion or spirituality of any participants. The following statements were embedded in the responses to the question, "What does morality mean to you?"

> Mine is partly based on my religious decisions and convictions about what I believe.
>
> Probably the best way to type me is as a 'conservative Roman Catholic'. But in terms of working in Student Development, I don't think I'm as judgmental.
>
> I believe we are all called; my vocation is in higher education and in serving students; I've been given gifts and have a responsibility to be a good steward of my gifts and to use them in ways that contribute to a just world.
>
> Conduct your life in a manner, and in my case it is as Christ taught us to do.

One dean disclaimed any religious influence, "I don't sit back and judge a situation with a background that is

religious or biblical." Another expressed, "I don't think moral people have to be religious." And a participant explained how "the conservatives would not label me with high spiritual morality; they probably think anyone who drinks is not."

"The notion of morality...is fundamentally personal" (Farrago, 1983). In reflecting on their own understanding of morality, several narrators made reference to influential voices from their past. "Partially it's based on the way my parents brought me up and what their own ethical and moral codes were, what their faiths and beliefs were." Another began, "all I can hear is momma saying..." And a third said, "What this has done has made me more and more thankful for the way my parents raised me and how I hope I can raise my daughter."

Both the care and justice perspectives were evident in all 31 narratives of real-life conflict. The authors of the Reading Guide (Brown et al., 1988) noted the importance of assessing the relationship between the moral perspectives in "those interviews where both justice and care are clearly evident" in order to begin exploring the implications for people's lives (p. 130). "Predominance" was suggested as a way to represent and understand the variations of the two perspectives in relation to each other.

Predominance of Moral Voice

"When justice and care are both articulated in the interview, but one orientation either frames the conflict or is more elaborated, we have referred to it as the 'predominant' orientation" (Brown et al., 1988, p. 131). Interpretive readers chose one of three options when determining which voice was more fully elaborated in a particular narrative: 1) the "Justice" voice predominated; 2) the "Care" voice predominated; or 3) "Neither" voice predominated, although both were present.

Neither voice predominated in 64% of the narratives of real-life conflict presented by the participants in this study. The "justice" voice was more salient in 22.6% and the "care" voice in 12.9%. Seven participants described both narratives with neither justice nor care as dominant. Five participants discussed two narratives which were each coded differently for predominance (i.e. one neither and one care, or one neither and the other care). There were two instances in which the justice voice was dominant in both narratives and likewise one instance where care was the dominant voice in both narratives.

Several participants were conscious about their inclusion of both justice and care concerns, especially when given the opportunity to discuss their own understanding of morality within the context of being a college administrator. As administrators, these women were concerned about

providing both effective management and appropriate services to students on their campuses. Narrators saw their role as intricately bound up with moral considerations.

> Especially in this role, a lot of times you have to think in terms of not only what is best for the individual, although you take that into account, but also what is of value for the group or institution... And that people are valuable; feeling good about themselves is important and that their friends are important also.

In this study, all of the narratives contained moral language which reflected both care and justice. Neither care nor justice was more fully elaborated in over 64% of the narratives; in those narratives where predominance was determined, justice scored higher than care. Table 6 summarizes the dimensions of presence and predominance of moral voice in the 31 real-life narratives.

Moral Perspective Alignment

When the question, "With which moral perspective do women administrators align in the resolution of moral conflict?" was raised in the data analysis, it was found that the participants aligned with both moral perspectives or with the care perspective. Alignment with justice occurred only two thirds as often as with care. However, the deans were more likely to use justice language than care language.

Alignment in this study refers to decisions made by the interpretive readers about a narrator's preference

Table 6

Moral Voice: Presence and Predominance Real-life Conflicts

NARRATIVE	PRESENCE	PREDOMINANCE
1a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Justice
2a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Justice
3a	Both	Justice
b	Both	Justice
4a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
5a	Both	Neither
6a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
7a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Care
8a	Both	Justice
b	Both	Justice
9a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
10a	Both	Care
b	Both	Care
11a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Justice
12a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
13a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
14a	Both	Care
b	Both	Neither
15a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither
16a	Both	Neither
b	Both	Neither

for a particular moral perspective; whether it was care, justice or a combined care/justice perspective. Decisions regarding alignment were made in several ways: 1) by examining important decisions; 2) by examining responses to "What was at stake for you?"; and 3) by examining other statements which revealed a close relationship between self and a particular voice.

After reading each narrative four times and following the process outlined in the Reading Guide, interpretive readers made decisions related to moral voice. The readers' task was to summarize how justice and care were related and how self and the moral voice were related. "Alignment" was decided after "presence" and "predominance" of moral voice in the overall summary was completed for each narrative. A distinction was made between explicit and implicit alignment. Explicit alignment meant that the self was "in line with" the voice; implicit alignment meant a perspective was used in such a way that it allowed one to believe the narrator was "attuned" to that perspective (Brown et al., 1988, pp. 108-109). The interpretive readers in this study found that alignment was the most difficult judgment to make in relation to the participants' real-life narratives. The Reading Guide offered a possible explanation.

> Alignment with a moral voice is easiest to interpret when the narrative self articulates both perspectives but actively rejects or dismisses one perspective as morally problematic ... and 'ex-

> plicitly' owns the other. It is a more difficult interpretation to make when the narrative self articulates both perspectives and "implicitly" favors one. (p. 136)

There were very few narratives in which the participants dismissed either justice or care. For those narratives which had a straight care or justice alignment, the evidence was generally more implied than directly stated.

As previously noted, both care and justice were "present" in all 31 narratives of real-life conflict with "neither" being "predominant" in 20 of the 31. However, in examining the choices participants made and also what they said was at stake for them, it became apparent that in 12 of the 31 narratives, participants aligned with care; in seven, there was an alignment with the justice perspective; and in 12, participants aligned with a combined care/justice perspective.

Alignment with the Care Perspective

There were 12 narratives in which the narrator aligned with the care perspective. Five of these were student-related conflicts; five were colleague-related, and two were employee-related. The care perspective gives voice to concerns about building, nurturing, and protecting relationships, and is attentive to issues of attachment and detachment and the experience of well-being and hurt in relationships. Alignment with the care perspective meant that the narrator showed preference for that voice or would have

voted for the care perspective if a vote had been taken. Two of those, who aligned with care, shared stories about meeting with resistance when they tried to provide sex education to students. One college president did not allow the dean to do educational programs about homosexuality.

> They just pretended it didn't exist. I wasn't even allowed to address it. It was total denial, which was upsetting to me because I was watching kids who had real concerns.

This dean, whose religious background basically forbade homosexuality, had not received much training about dealing with these concerns among the college student population, yet she looked for ways to present an "openness" to students about this. Someone at a conference suggested that she put books on the coffee table in her office to indicate that she had done some reading about gay and lesbian issues. This strategy worked.

> My office was high traffic. They would come in and out and eventually they came in and closed the door and started to talk and that was good. I went [to the residence halls] at night to find open discussion... and actually let people ask me questions point blank.

Her decision to risk action in a situation where her own needs and those of the students were at odds with college policy made apparent her alignment with the care perspective. She eventually left the position, stating "I was

being turned into someone who was not their advocate but rather their adversary."

In a similar story, a dean was told not to circulate sex education booklets to the students. She had purchased these in response to several pregnancies on campus. "I don't care to have unwanted babies born because of lack of information." However, her job was at stake; "I had to give in or I had to lose my job." It was through that experience, which happened several years ago, that this dean decided she had to be innovative about responding to others' needs while taking care of herself as well. She spoke of the importance of getting information across to students "without offending anybody."

> I know if today I got condoms and put them in the halls without getting clearance, I'd have the same thing. But I've gotten wiser as I've gotten older and try to find ways to solve that problem without being confronted.

Even though these two deans also voiced the justice perspective throughout the narratives, their decisions made it evident that they aligned with care. The other ten narratives were similar in terms of some clearly stated evidence or action which indicated an alignment of the self with the care perspective in a specific situation. One of the two participants who aligned with the care perspective in both narratives was primarily concerned about relationships in conflicts which also involved issues of fairness.

In the first, she had a strong disagreement with a colleague over his insistence that students pay for repairs to an area where they had carved initials into wet cement. Her answer to the interviewer's question, "What was most at stake for you in this conflict?" expressed her alignment with care by placing emphasis on protecting relationships.

> After we had the conflict...you let your emotions make you angry, but then when I thought about it, I said, I can't let this go on. I've got to call him and confront it head on. Eat humble pie ... apologize for yelling at him, whatever, but I needed to restore the relationship, which is more important. I'd rather pay you the money out of my own pocket; I'm not going to charge the students. That's ludicrous. I would have lost all the credibility I ever had with students if I had done that.

Even though she stood up for the rights of the students, she cared most about her relationship with her colleague and her credibility with the students. In her second narrative, this same dean described another conflict which involved a more serious long-term conflict with a colleague. Her response to "What was most at stake for you?" again revealed a strong alignment with the care perspective.

> I think it was continuing job satisfaction. Because when I'm pleased with the people I'm working with, it just makes my job easier. There was an awful lot of mental energy going into this conflict that was negative for me and for the students, for everyone.

Those who are aligned with care have certain vulnerabilities such as a) paralysis of action because of loyalty to someone or something which may cause blindness to the larger picture; b) inability to acknowledge that someone might get hurt no matter what action is taken; or c) denial or sacrifice of self for the sake of another (Brown et al., 1988, pp. 95-97). Two participants, who told about real-life conflicts and aligned with care in that narrative, described an aspect of vulnerability.

One dean had recently been involved in a judicial hearing of an alleged date rape which involved two students. She saw her role as one of advocacy for both the woman and the man.

> I have always envisioned my role as serving as an advocate. ...I need to feel that the student's interest has been served much more than the institution's.

In hearing the case, the dean began to feel "somewhat suspicious" of some of the information provided by the young woman. Then she "would listen and be a counselor and think, how could he (the accused) be bruised to the extent that she (the accuser) was?" In the end, the male was suspended for the summer, to which the general response on campus had been "exceedingly critical". And both students felt betrayed by the dean.

> In spite of the fact that I have tried to balance my role, it has not come out really well. I've

> not felt really good about it. They feel like I've betrayed them and I've internalized that to a certain extent....I felt I could balance those roles; only in hearing from them that I wasn't doing a good job. That made me feel bad.

This dean clearly cared about her relationship with students, yet in this particular conflict, she felt unable to "be the person to work with both sides." She expressed feelings of being in a no-win situation trying to simultaneously play both roles, that of helper and judicial officer, for two different people making accusations to one another. Her conclusion that "my roles need to be more clearly and cleanly defined" acknowledged a justice voice, which she may have called upon to help her out of this "feeling rotten inside."

The second example of vulnerability to care involved a dean who spoke of being in the middle of a difficult situation involving a relatively new employee. She had given him major responsibility, and she felt that he was not loyal or supportive to her. She talked with him about her own leadership style and her desire to work as a team. However, she continued to feel unsupported and even personally attacked by him. His criticism of her was blatant; "in the office, he had undermined me even with other staff members." She chose to confront him about his behavior and "kept thinking that things would get better." But things got even worse and after discussion with the president, she told the

employee, "I am not feeling support or loyalty; I can't operate like this, so I'm not going to." The employee then became angry and announced to the students that he had been fired, and this resulted in a general upset on campus. At the time of the interview, this conflict was still in progress and the narrator was still in the midst of processing the event. In explaining why this was the "worst thing I've ever had to deal with", she said,

> I've been around for a long time; people know me and know my character and job performance. Student evaluations were always extremely high, and I would kill myself working to make sure that was true because I've always been here for the students. I don't have trouble getting along with anybody and I guess that's the reason that something like this hurts.

As one who preferred to align with care, she seemed to have great difficulty shifting to an alignment with justice in a situation where she was the one being oppressed.

Alignment with the Justice Perspective

In seven of the 31 narratives, the participants aligned with the justice perspective. Six of these were primarily student-related (and often included relationships with parents, colleagues, or other administrators as well) and one was employee-related. The narrator acted as judicial officer in five of the six student-related conflicts, and as supervisor in the remaining two justice-aligned narratives.

The same process was used to make decisions about participants' alignment with the justice perspective: a) by examining the reasons given for the decision a participant made; b) by examining her response to "What was at stake for you?"; and c) by examining other statements which revealed a close relationship between self and a particular voice.

The justice perspective gives voice to concerns about equality and reciprocity in relationships, and is attentive to authority, rules, principles and the experience of fairness and consistency. The vulnerabilities associated with the justice perspective suggest that one may: a) mistake a conventional standard or traditional perspective for objective truth; b) become blind to consequences of decisions; c) lose sight of difference, or special needs, or particular consequences; or d) exclude someone in the search for the right solution or answer (Brown et al., 1988, pp. 112-114).

One of the participants in this group described a situation where a parent attempted to influence her daughter to disregard an administrative decision. Feeling extremely annoyed, the dean complained to her supervisor, "some of us can be in charge but all of us can't be in charge." Though she understood that this situation "caused a great deal of trauma to the student, who was torn between directions from both her parent and the college," the dean viewed it as a "direct challenge to authority and something that was just

not tolerable." She denied the student's appeal and recommended that the young woman be suspended if she did not comply with the previous order to move to another residence hall. The mother continued the conflict by going to the president determined that her daughter would not move. The dean stood firm in her position to maintain justice throughout the entire narrative and concluded,

> If she chooses not to move, then we have no choice but to sever her relationship with the university. ...If we were not going to be able to enforce our rules and regulations through a process that was fair with the judicial procedure and the right to appeal, then we had lost a grip on everything that was important.

The conflict became a struggle between the dean and an insistent mother and revealed one of the vulnerabilities of the justice perspective: "perceiving all persons as separate, equal selves may make one blind to differences, or special needs, or particular circumstances" (Brown et al., 1988, p. 112). The reader never got a sense about what was of greatest concern to the mother, except that her daughter should not have to move. The circumstances of the student and her mother were not provided by the narrator, who insisted the single issue was "her failure to comply with the directive from an administrative hearing."

Another narrative which illustrated the justice perspective described a group of students found guilty of an honor code violation whose parents also became involved.

The accused had removed an artifact from one of the rooms and had hidden it on campus without telling anyone its whereabouts when information was sought. Both the students and their parents felt that this action should have been treated as a prank rather than as stealing, which is an honor code violation. Unlike the narrator in the previous situation, this dean described in detail the way the students and parents felt.

> The three students involved became martyrs. They viewed it as a prank and thought it should have been handled as a conduct violation. So they've appealed and had marches and arm bands which is fine.
>
> When parents start getting involved, you feel the anguish that parents feel for their children. All the parent wants to do is stop the child's suffering. The parents feel it should have been handled differently.

The dean's decision to uphold the honor code strictly revealed her alignment with the justice perspective in this conflict. She described in detail how "stealing in the college handbook includes any improper removal of college property; not just criminal stealing." When asked what was at stake, she described the college hierarchy and how she stood firmly behind the President who was "getting serious advice from the Board of Trustees that she must not back down." She described the honor code as

> the overriding morality of this college; always respecting the rights and protecting the rights of

> the individual, but knowing there are certain behaviors that are just not acceptable. I ascribe to that totally; I don't think I could work here if I didn't.

She added that her own credibility with students was at stake and framed this acknowledgement in terms of an "obligation to support them in any way I can". This dean, who had a counselor background, spoke several times about coming from a student development point of view. She was comfortable voicing the care perspective, yet in this particular situation, both readers agreed that she aligned with justice. The dean in the first illustration of alignment with justice voiced very little of the care perspective, except when she defined morality as "being sensitive to the situation...sensitive to the person." An examination of a narrator's moral language was not the key to determining her alignment with a particular moral perspective.

In a third narrative, alignment with justice was determined by what emerged as the central issue for the narrator. There was some violence between a white and a black student, which caused a collective upset on the campus. In explaining the complexities of the situation, she described how she made decisions as one of the central actors in the drama. She was asked to address questions in public before having all the facts; she immediately saw to it that the factual information was carefully collected. Prior to the hearing, she decided to send a memo "to the community, which was

designed for rumor control and to protect the due process rights of those students." Then at the judicial hearing, a member of the committee accused her of biasing the process by sending a memo which alluded to a racially motivated incident. The central conflict for the narrator became clear after this public confrontation with a colleague in the midst of an already complex situation.

> And I have been a long-time advocate of academic freedom, but I'm also an advocate for civil behavior. ...and I think this is the classic issue. Where do first amendment rights and bigotry begin? Do you limit posters which have racial slurs on them and still allow an open honest environment of academic freedom where anyone is free to speak his own mind. What is the responsibility of the college for clear messages about this kind of behavior?

This participant also expressed a high level of the care perspective, "I would rather that the institution would err in being humane". In this narrative, there was agreement among the interpretive readers that she aligned with justice. Indeed, as in so many other narratives, this was a multi-dimensional conflict, in which the administrator sought clarity.

> When that kind of thing happens, whether it's sexism or racism or homophobia, everybody is turning their heads to the administration to do something. I don't have clear messages about what to do. I don't even have clarity in my own mind. I want some guidelines!

Alignment with Both the Care and Justice Perspectives

Nine of 16 participants in this study aligned with both care and justice in at least one narrative of real-life conflict. This combination care/justice alignment was determined by readers in a total of 12 narratives. The majority of these (9 of 12) were student-related; two were employee-related and one was related to a colleague and one to others on campus. In the narratives where self aligned with both the care and justice perspectives, participants were most often performing in their role as judicial officer (6 of 12) or supervisor (4 of 12).

An alignment with both care and justice meant that in the telling of a particular narrative, the narrator would align with one perspective in part of the story and then with the other in another part. In other words, she shifted moral perspectives, not just moral language. One participant talked about such a shift when she answered the question, "Do you consider these conflicts to be moral problems?" She described the difficulty she had experienced with a long-term employee when she first became Dean of the college. This employee had directed the health program for over 15 years; the dean wanted to change the program "into a more proactive rather than reactive direction." The dean worked with the health director for almost two years before she decided not to renew the director's contract.

> I would not have felt good about just arbitrarily dismissing her immediately. To me it would have been immoral not to have given that a chance. When that didn't happen, my obligation focused back to the students; I had an obligation to provide them with the kind of health care and health education I thought they needed to be productive members of society. My obligation to them sort of over-rode. I felt I had fulfilled my obligation to her. My moral obligation definitely shifted in that situation.

She spoke in predominantly justice language and indeed aligned with justice. Her alignment with care was implicitly revealed in her willingness to work for almost two years with someone who was quite resistant to the changes the dean wanted to introduce. Her final decision to fire the health director was based on justice considerations; however, her initial strategy to "constantly make suggestions and plant seeds and hope that she would pick up on that" was based on care. So after two years--"it was a lot of trouble because I cared about her"--she shifted her alignment to a justice perspective. Early in the narrative, she stated,

> The conflict was between the humanistic side that wants to take care of people and empathizes, ... against the administrative side that knows you've got a job to do and things have to be a certain way.

The administrative side ultimately won out in this conflict between care and justice. When asked what was at stake, the narrator explained, "I was in the chief administrative

position and knew how I wanted the health program to fit into our student development model; my job was at stake!"

Their administrative role may be the key to understanding the frequent alignment with the combined care/justice perspective among these women who are senior-level student-services administrators. After trying many other approaches to avoid having to fire the health director, the dean sought advice from her president.

> I turned it into a more legal situation trying to depersonalize it, which I was advised to do by my president. ...It's still hard because I have the conflict about caring about the person and caring about getting the job done. The longer I'm in it, the more I'm able to separate those and just put aside my feelings for the person and treat it as a job to do. That's still very difficult.

Perhaps the administrative role provides a kind of "training for justice," especially for those who are aligned with care when they enter administration. A young woman in her first deanship talked about a conflict situation which exemplified how one may initially align with care and shift to the justice perspective "to get the job done" as the previous dean had done. In this narrative, the dean told about a problem she had encountered with a "fellow administrator." The two colleagues served on a committee to plan a program for new students. The narrator explained that she began to get a sense at meetings of "a lot of manipulation, my being set up." She apparently was not the

only one who noticed this; "there were some other folks that were having the same problems, so luckily we were able to talk about it". The conflict escalated and she found herself "constantly having to strategize about how we would accomplish certain things and go about doing things." The narrator's description of self revealed her alignment with both care and justice.

> I don't like a schemer and ... I don't do it well and it feels so uncomfortable for me. I'm generally a very trusting person so suddenly I realized that I had to learn that I was swimming basically with sharks. And if I was going to swim with sharks, then I too had to become as confrontive, and not necessarily in a deceitful way or negative way, but I had to play that game they were playing. And I didn't like that at all.

In order to protect the program ideas she felt the incoming students needed desperately, this dean described herself learning how to fight for her rights. "I had to stand very firmly in what I believed was right and had to play more of her game." The game consisted of "strategizing", getting "key players" involved, working with "a couple of people who were more than willing to challenge her", and "talking with our supervisor" in order that "this other person did not really have a choice" but to accept the program. When asked how she felt about the way it was resolved, the narrator said,

> I feel so good. ...I don't like to have to be as confrontive as I've had to be, but I've had to if

> I've wanted to get it accomplished. And that was uncomfortable for me at first, but now I almost find that I'm getting used to it, so that's good.

Her initial statements in this narrative reflected her "need to really support that individual, to be loyal" and described their relationship as "a very strong and good relationship ... ever since I had come to the college." Throughout the story, she protected the identity of the administrator by not revealing the other person's job title or gender. By the end of the story, the dean was clearly "justifying" ways of acting with which she did not feel entirely comfortable for the sake of a program to "meet the more survival and transition needs of our students." And perhaps her alignment with the justice perspective in this narrative was necessary in order to meet her own survival needs as a new administrator.

Another participant expressed a combined care/justice alignment in her narrative about a judicial case which involved over 20 students. All the students had violated the visitation policy by their presence at a late night party; some of them were also guilty of breaking the alcohol policy. The first decision facing this dean was whether or not to pursue complete information about the event. Timing was not good; it happened shortly before the Christmas break. The dean also received an incomplete and inaccurate report about who was present; some students jumped out the

window; others signed false names. "Do we go after the kids who slipped out, or do we just go with the names that we have?" Concerns related to both care and justice were manifest in her thinking through the initial decision.

> I knew if we made the choice to go after everyone, we'd get a real bad image on campus. But in my mind, I could not justify allowing people to get away with something just because they ran or because they wrote a false name. It would have been a lot easier on me to have just gone with the information I had been given. I decided that I could not live with myself unless we went after the whole group.

The entire process took three weeks which were stressful to the narrator. She called each student in for questioning in an effort to get at the truth about who was involved. The students did not want to involve anyone else by telling, so she "let them tell what they wanted to tell and they signed a paper admitting they were guilty and would take the sanctions whatever they were." She still did not have the whole story.

> That's when I had to get tough, and this was hard on me, because I knew the original guys had lied to me and not told me who was there, for whatever 'honor among thieves' code they had among themselves. So I called them back in and I also contacted the coach and said, 'the guys have lied to me and I will absolutely kick them out of school if they don't come up here and come clean because I am mad'.

Admitting that she never really liked to suspend anyone, the dean added, "it was a great threat though." This

approach worked and all the students who attended the party finally came forward and pleaded guilty. The dean was glad "we decided to pursue this situation, because it got the message out on campus that you don't fool around and you don't come in here and lie." If the story had ended here, the alignment decision for that narrator might have resembled a strictly justice perspective; her decisions were based on issues of fairness and equal treatment. Her alignment with care is revealed in her response to "what was at stake for you in this situation?"

> What was at stake for me was my good name among students, because I do have a very good relationship with students. ... and I hate being the bad guy and not be able to walk on campus and talk to people. I was afraid of losing that comfort on my own campus.

In this narrative, one who basically preferred to align with care was also able to make decisions and act from the justice perspective. She reported that "most of the students, who took the time to come and talk with me about it, understood when I explained." She was not seen as a "bad guy" in the end.

Narrators described events which seemed to necessitate the use of more than one perspective in dealing with their work-related conflicts. The content or central issue involved in the narrative did not determine alignment; i.e., alignment was not the same in the two date rape cases, nor

in the way the four staff terminations were handled, nor in the 15 judicial cases. Alignment was better understood when the narrator talked about what was at stake for her and about the decisions she made within the basic framework of her relationships and roles (context). Table 7 summarizes alignment along with presence and predominance of moral voice.

Moral Perspective by Context

The question finally asked was, "Do women administrators change moral perspective by virtue of the context in which the conflicts occur?" This study showed that there is a relationship between context and moral perspective.

Context has been described in terms of the relationships and roles which provided the framework for each real-life conflict described by participants. Narrators' relationships were students (21), colleagues (8), employees (6), administration (5), others (8); or a combination. Narrators' roles were judicial officer (14), educator/advocate (4), supervisor (6), and other (7).

Context of Relationships

When the various sets of narratives were compared with one another, care appeared more frequently as the predominant voice in the colleague-related narratives than in any other group. Participants aligned with care in 5 of 8

Table 7

Presence, Predominance & Alignment for Real-life Conflicts

NARRATIVE	PRESENCE	PREDOMINANCE	ALIGNMENT
1a	Both	Neither	Care
b	Both	Justice	Justice
2a	Both	Neither	Care
b	Both	Justice	Justice
3a	Both	Justice	Combined
b	Both	Justice	Justice
4a	Both	Neither	Combined
b	Both	Neither	Care
5a	Both	Neither	Care
6a	Both	Neither	Combined
b	Both	Neither	Care
7a	Both	Neither	Care
b	Both	Care	Care
8a	Both	Justice	Justice
b	Both	Justice	Justice
9a	Both	Neither	Combined
b	Both	Neither	Combined
10a	Both	Care	Combined
b	Both	Care	Care
11a	Both	Neither	Justice
b	Both	Justice	Justice
12a	Both	Neither	Combined
b	Both	Neither	Combined
13a	Both	Neither	Care
b	Both	Neither	Care
14a	Both	Care	Care
b	Both	Neither	Combined
15a	Both	Neither	Combined
b	Both	Neither	Combined
16a	Both	Neither	Care
b	Both	Neither	Combined
Total %	Both 100%	Neither 64.5%	Combined 38.7%
		Justice 22.6%	Justice 22.6%
		Care 12.9%	Care 38.7%

colleague-related narratives, which was a much higher percentage for alignment than in the total group or any other subgroup. Participants in this study were more inclined to both use the care voice and to align with care in those situations which involved colleagues.

Table 8 is a summary of "predominance" and "alignment" percentages for the total group of 31 narratives and for each of five subgroups involving students, employees, colleagues, administration, and others. The subgroup total does not equal 31 because narratives were classified in more than one subgroup.

Context of Role

When the primary role of the narrator became the basis for examining narratives, four subgroups were formed; those in which the narrator performed as judicial officer, those in which she was an educator/advocate, those in which she acted as supervisor, and then in roles different from the other three. An examination of these groups revealed that the justice voice was more predominant in the judicial officer role than in any other subgroup or the total group. Alignment with care was most evident when participants acted in their educator/advocate role.

The most obvious differences within the role subgroups appeared in relation to where the care voice was present or mute and where alignment with care was most evident. For example, when participants acted as judicial officer, care

Table 8

Context and Relationships by Predominance and Alignment with Moral Perspective

	PREDOMINANCE		
	NEITHER	CARE	JUSTICE
TOTAL GROUP (31)*	64.5%	12.9%	22.6%
Subgroups in Narratives**			
STUDENTS (21)	71.4%	4.8%	23.8%
EMPLOYEES (6)	66.7%	0.0	33.3%
COLLEAGUES (8)	37.5%	37.5%	25.0%
ADMINISTRATION (5)	80.0%	0.0	20.0%
OTHERS (8)	62.5%	12.5%	25.0%

	ALIGNMENT		
	COMBINED	CARE	JUSTICE
TOTAL GROUP (31)*	38.7%	38.7%	22.6%
Subgroups in Narratives**			
STUDENTS (21)	47.6%	23.8%	28.6%
EMPLOYEES (6)	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%
COLLEAGUES (8)	12.5%	62.5%	25.0%
ADMINISTRATION (5)	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%
OTHERS (8)	37.5%	25.0%	37.5%

* There were 16 participants; 15 described two real-life narratives and one described one for a total of 31.

** Numbers after subgroup headings do not equal total group (31) because narratives were classified in more than one subgroup.

was the aligned perspective in 13.3% compared to 36.4% of the overall group. Care was the alignment in 100% of the conflicts (4) where their primary role was educator/advocate and in 57.1% of those with the "other" roles (see Table 9.)

Standardized Student Issue

The researcher concluded the interview with each participant by asking her to respond to a recent real-life conflict which occurred at a campus located in North Carolina. None of the participants had ever worked at that campus; most of them were familiar with the incident because it received national media coverage. The outcome was that in this standardized student issue across all participants, justice was the moral perspective most often used. In comparison, the real-life issues showed a greater alignment with care.

The interviewer began by saying, "The last thing I'd like to discuss with you is a situation which happened at Wake Forest University last summer." She then read the following news account from the November 28, 1989, Winston-Salem Journal.

> The student at Wake Forest University who smuggled out television tapes of the shooting at Beijing's Tiananmen Square has been charged before the school's Honor Council with lying in order to go near the square. The charge against ..., a senior who expected to graduate last August, will be heard tonight. ...two professors who led a group of 28 students to China last spring, say that ... lied in telling them that he would not go to the square when he left the group's hotel on the out-

> skirts of Beijing. "The basic charge is that we gave instructions to members of the group that they should not be going anywhere near the square. It turned out later that this one student did...told us that where he was going would not be near the square. The charge is that he told us one thing, then did something else.
>
> ... ended up watching the struggle the night of June 3 from a foreign correspondent's hotel room about three blocks from the square. Before the students left Beijing, an NBC News crew gave (the student) tapes to take to Hong Kong. Those tapes were seen on a June 4 special report on the Beijing massacre. NBC officials later told him that 20 million ... saw that broadcast. (pp. 1 & 4)

The interviewer asked each participant, "If you were the dean, how would you have handled this situation or liked to have seen it handled?" Since the participants were asked to comment "as if" they were the Dean of Students at Wake Forest, these commentaries were considered more as hypothetical than real-life conflicts. The same interpretive procedures were used to analyze the Wake Forest commentaries as were used with the real-life narratives. When comparing "presence" and "predominance" of moral voice and "alignment" of moral perspective between the real-life narratives and the Wake Forest commentaries, there were significant differences noted.

Table 10 lists the interpretive decisions made regarding "presence", "predominance" and "alignment" for the 15 Wake Forest commentaries and a summary of the same for the 31 real-life narratives. Time limits prevented one

Table 9

Context and Roles by Predominance and Alignment with Moral Perspective

	PREDOMINANCE		
	NEITHER	CARE	JUSTICE
TOTAL GROUP (31)*	64.5%	12.9%	22.6%
Subgroups in Narratives**			
JUDICIAL OFFICER (14)	57.1%	7.2%	35.7%
EDUCATOR/ADVOCATE (4)	100.0%	--	--
SUPERVISOR (6)	66.7%	0.0	33.3%
OTHER (7)	57.1%	42.9%	0.0

	ALIGNMENT		
	COMBINED	CARE	JUSTICE
TOTAL GROUP (31)*	38.7%	38.7%	22.6%
Subgroups in Narratives**			
JUDICIAL OFFICER (14)	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%
EDUCATOR/ADVOCATE (4)	--	100.0%	--
SUPERVISOR (6)	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%
OTHER (7)	28.6%	57.1%	14.3%

participant from doing this part of the interview; there were 15, rather than 16 Wake Forest commentaries.

When comparing the Wake Forest commentaries with the real-life narratives, the "presence", "predominance" and"alignment" with justice were much more evident in the Wake Forest commentaries. Both justice and care voices were present in all the real-life narratives; in the Wake Forest commentaries, both voices were present in 73.3% and justice was present in 26.7%. The justice voice was predominant in 60% of the Wake Forest commentaries and in less than 25% of the real-life narratives. Care was not predominant in any of the Wake Forest commentaries and was in four of the real-life narratives. Alignment with justice went from 22.3% in the real-life narratives to 60% in the Wake Forest commentaries, whereas alignment with care went from 38.7% in the real-life narratives to 6.7%. Only one of 15 aligned with care in the Wake Forest commentaries.

Participants in this study used more justice when thinking about how they would respond to a situation which happened at another university. The care perspective was not evoked as the predominant voice in the Wake Forest commentaries, and only in one of the 15 did a participant align with care when discussing the Wake Forest conflict. In the real-life narratives, participants aligned with justice more in situations where they were performing in their judicial officer role. The Wake Forest conflict also

Table 10

Presence, Predominance and Alignment in Standardized Student Issues Compared with Real-life Narratives

STANDARDIZED STUDENT ISSUES

COMMENTARY	PRESENCE	PREDOMINANCE	ALIGNMENT
1	JUSTICE	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
2	BOTH	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
3	BOTH	NEITHER	COMBINED
4	BOTH	NEITHER	COMBINED
5	BOTH	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
6	BOTH	NEITHER	JUSTICE
7	JUSTICE	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
8	JUSTICE	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
9	BOTH	JUSTICE	COMBINED
10	JUSTICE	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
11	BOTH	NEITHER	COMBINED
12	BOTH	NEITHER	COMBINED
13	BOTH	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
14	BOTH	JUSTICE	JUSTICE
15	BOTH	NEITHER	CARE
TOTAL %	BOTH 73.3% JUSTICE 26.7%	NEITHER 40% JUSTICE 60%	COMBINED 33.3% JUSTICE 60.0% CARE 6.7%

REAL-LIFE NARRATIVES

	PRESENCE	PREDOMINANCE	ALIGNMENT
TOTAL %	BOTH 100%	NEITHER 64.5% CARE 12.9% JUSTICE 22.6%	COMBINED 38.7% CARE 38.7% JUSTICE 22.6%

involved a disciplinary case and participants acted "as if" they were handling a judicial decision. Still there was a much higher level of justice alignment revealed in the 15 Wake Forest commentaries (60%) than in the 14 real-life narratives (35.7%) in which the participants acted as judicial officer.

The issues raised in the Wake Forest incident evoked justice considerations; a student was charged with violating the honor code and had to face a disciplinary hearing. Most of the participants agreed that they would have followed the basic process that Wake Forest followed in handling this case. One participant voiced her respect for Wake Forest University:

> Each campus does have their own moral code and moral ethic... We have problems with our honor code ... because the students don't take it seriously. At Wake Forest, they take it very literally, that if I lie to you, if I say I'm going to do something and I don't do it, at Wake Forest they take that seriously.

Most participants expressed strong belief in trusting the established system based on justice to work.

> First of all, I would have followed the procedures I had established and that if the procedures basically said that lying equals this and equalling this means that the consequences would therefore be that the student didn't graduate, then I would have followed that regardless of whether or not it was commencement time or not.
>
> I believe that systems exist for a reason and you ought to trust the system and let his peers review him or whatever system is in place.

> We expect every student to ascribe to that [honor code] and if they can't, they should go to school elsewhere. Or if they feel it needs to be changed, they should work through the system to change it.

Most participants also thought that the faculty did the right thing by charging the student with lying. There was general agreement that the student needed to face the consequences of his action even if the lie was told for a higher principle. The following represent a justice perspective.

> I would take him to the court. ...if you ask me what I would have done if I were in his shoes; I would have gone down to the Square too (laughing) and taken my lumps when I got back. I think there are certain risks you have to take in life; you have to be responsible for them.
>
> He may have done the world a service, but he still lied to his faculty members. For that action, there needs to be some sanctions. He still chopped down the cherry tree and he needs to take responsibility for that.
>
> I think the most important thing with judicial, and this is what college is all about, is connecting choices and consequences.
>
> I think about during slavery, sure, people violated the law for harboring fugitive slaves, but what they did was right. So they have to suffer for violating the law, but knowing what they did was right. So I think this young man has to accept the consequences.

One third of the participants (5) aligned with both care and justice in their comments on the Wake Forest incident. They stressed the importance of looking at all sides of the issue and gathering the facts before making a decision. They believed actions have consequences, but the

context of the situation is also extremely important. They were concerned about implications to all involved both on the trip and even those going on future trips. This group would have made the charges and used the judicial process, but felt more sympathy for the student's circumstances. They were representative of the combined care/justice alignment which places greater emphasis on consideration of special circumstances.

> My guess is the student at Wake probably said to them, 'I didn't realize I was putting anybody else at risk. I knew that I was putting myself at risk but I didn't think about the rest of the group'. An apology is certainly in order; I don't see ending his career on one incident.
>
> I don't have problems with him being charged with lying. Where I'd like to see it head is, 'yes, he lied; we do find him guilty of lying; but under the circumstances he is not going to be penalized.'...I can't see anything to be served by sanctioning him.
>
> What bothers me about this situation more than anything is holding up his graduation. If the student did not have a prior record, I'm not so sure I would have thought suspension or delay of his graduation was appropriate.

The one participant who aligned with care in commenting on the Wake Forest judicial hearing was concerned about why these things can not be handled through discussion and mediation. She spoke about the imbalance which has come about by too much emphasis on rules and policies. This is an example of someone who disclaims one perspective in favor of the other.

> The other trend I see..is that we must have a rule against it; we can't sit and talk any more with students about our feelings regarding inappropriate behavior. There has to be a rule and there has to be a hearing. And that bothers me. I see that trend nationally and here. Perhaps we need policy statements...I'm not so sure we need a rule because it pigeonholes everything.

One of the participants provided a powerful example of how the community values can evoke different responses to similar events. She explained that a group from her own campus was also in China during the Tienanman Square revolution. Disregarding the faculty member's warning to the students about the dangers of leaving the hotel, one of the students left anyway. While out on his own, the student got shot in the leg with a rubber bullet. Her comments about what happened when the student returned to campus demonstrated how two campuses responded differently to a very similar event based on community values!

> I think on this campus, his actions may have been supported. Because of the value, and that's the difference between each campus. Our student, the one who was shot, was from a small town and he got a huge welcome from his friends. The professor was very mad that he did that and said, "don't ever do that again". And that's really all that was done. If I tried to take that before our judicial system, I'd be laughed at.

This study showed a relationship between context (of relationships and roles) and moral perspective, as well as between contexts actually experienced and a given context posed as a hypothetical dilemma. How these findings compare

with the theory of moral development proposed by Gilligan and her associates will be further developed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to describe the moral voices of senior-level women administrators of student services in private four-year colleges. Gilligan's moral development theory proposed that women are likely to use more than one moral voice in their deliberations about inner moral conflict. The narratives about real-life conflict from 16 women administrators were analyzed for presence, predominance, and alignment with moral voice to explore this proposition. Four areas guided the analysis of the narratives: context of moral conflict; moral language in inner conflict; moral perspective alignment; and moral perspective by context.

Data were collected through personal interviews which were tape recorded and transcribed for data analysis. The participants were 16 female senior-level administrators employed in student services in private colleges and universities in six states; their positions ranged from Dean of Students to Vice President for Student Development. The interview format and the method for analysis of data were developed from the Reading Guide (Brown at al., 1988).

Selected quotations from the interviews were included in Chapter IV to illustrate how presence and predominance of

moral voice were expressed and how alignment with moral perspective was determined. Data analyses were presented for each of the four research questions. Tables were used to illustrate the findings.

A major stimulus for this investigation was a need to understand how the moral perspectives of care and justice are played out in the lives of women who hold senior-level student services positions. There was a dearth of information concerning moral development theory and its relationship to administrative practice. The study was limited to female participants in order to contribute to recent research exploring the development of women.

Conclusions

Data gathered from the 16 participants provided answers to the research questions; a synopsis of the findings and a discussion of the implications are presented for each question.

Question One: What kinds of situations do women administrators of student services in higher education report as causing inner moral conflict?

An understanding of each situation was sought by analyzing the context (relationships and roles), the content (what caused inner conflict for the narrator), and the underlying issue or concern expressed by the narrator. The

inner conflict essentially became the moral conflict when considerations about doing the right thing or making the right decision were discussed by the narrator.

The 31 narratives of real-life conflict not only revealed accounts of personal struggles, they also represented issues commonly faced by student services administrators in higher education. Some of the recurring themes were maintaining credibility with students, working with emotionally unstable students, protecting confidentiality, concern for personal and institutional liability, securing due process, and consideration of individual circumstances and needs. Some aspect of "self" was always described as being at risk, whether it was personal or in relation to students or in relation with others or in terms of some loss to the institution. Within the situations, administrators had to decide how they were going to negotiate relationships while performing in their various roles.

Gilligan's moral development theory proposed certain underlying moral questions within situations of conflict: what is the most just decision based on persons' rights related to fair and equal treatment? and what is the most responsible decision based on persons' needs for interdependence in relationships? When talking about their situations of real-life conflict, the participants continually raised issues related to the safety, health, and welfare of students, others, and themselves. They also raised concerns

about protecting the rights of students, others, and themselves. Because their role itself involves attending to the welfare of all students and protecting the rights of all students, the participants in this study recognized that they continually function within the moral domain. One dean described how she felt about the frequency of moral conflict in relation to the complexity of her role.

> It's like with this kind of job you have conflicts every day, ... is there any other position out there that has as many moral and ethical dilemmas as ours does? We have it with so many constituencies: students, faculty, staff, other administrators, board of trustees, visitors at the college, those kind of things, so it's a lot of different constituents.

Deans are not the only ones to recognize the sensitive nature of their roles. A well-known college president once referred to student-affairs divisions as the "institutional conscience" (Monat, 1985). Participants in this study described themselves negotiating relationships in conflict situations with most of the constituencies mentioned (students, staff, colleagues, administrators, parents, and others) performing in their various complex roles (judicial officer, supervisor, educator/advocate, planner, counselor, etc.).

Question Two: What is the moral language used by senior-level administrators in their description of the resolution of conflict?

The moral development theory used to frame the questions in this study proposed that "each person, regardless of gender, is capable of formulating issues of moral conflict from both justice and care perspectives." (Smith, et al., 1989 citing Gilligan, 1988; Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1988; Johnston, 1988) The theory also predicts that whereas males are more likely to use the justice voice spontaneously, females tend to use care spontaneously. In this study, which included female participants only, it was found that the women administrators combined both care and justice voices in their descriptions and considerations of moral conflict. Neither care nor justice was more dominant in the majority of the narratives; in those narratives where predominance of one voice was determined, justice tended to be more predominant than care. This is reminiscent of conclusions Gilligan, Johnston, and Miller (1988) made in relation to predominance in their Green River School Study. "Predominance cannot be seen as a stable, gender-specific trait, but is better understood as a choice of moral orientation in particular conflicts and in a particular context which changes over time" (p. 26).

Females have only recently joined the ranks of senior-level positions in the administration of higher education

and still have a relatively small yet growing representation. The majority of the participants in this study had educational backgrounds and experiences (i.e., in counseling, student development, and student personnel) which allowed them to use and develop their care voice. Several mentioned the shift in perspective they had to make in moving to administration. In the administrative setting, these women found it was advantageous to use their justice voice. One of the deans explained how it was for her being the only woman on the president's cabinet and "speaking a whole other language."

> I tend to be quieter in those meetings than I am in most others; I have to struggle with, should I speak? or should I be quiet? I'm trying to learn to think things through. If I talk in intuitive or feeling-kinds of terms, they won't hear me. Speaking a whole other language and maybe helping them to learn a little bit of a different language in terms of the way they deal with things. [how?] It's different in the sense that I am more student-oriented and maybe that's just in my role as Dean of Students. It's hard to describe; maybe it's that sense of nurturing.

It makes sense that newcomers to a professional role, i.e., women in senior-level administrative positions, would choose to "quiet" their care voice and develop their justice voice which is more frequently used in that setting. However, unlike the female adolescents, whose "care voice gets stuck in deference to others" (Smith, 1989, citing Brown, 1989; Gilligan, Brown, & Rogers, 1988), the majority of the

women in this study ultimately integrated the two voices. Persons become more flexible and less rigid in how they view situations from a moral perspective by learning to articulate and use both the care voice and the justice voice. Also, it has been stated that "a combination of both care and justice across moral conflicts is predicted to result in greater equity" (Smith, 1989). A dual commitment required of the student-affairs administrator speaks to the ideal of equity through dedication to the development of individuals and to the protection of individual human rights.

Question Three: With which moral perspective do senior-level women administrators align in the resolution of moral conflict?

In the data analysis, it was found that the women administrators aligned with both moral perspectives or with the care perspective. Alignment with justice occurred only two thirds as often as care even though the deans were more likely to use justice language than care language. Moral language was not a key to determining alignment with a particular moral perspective.

Several narratives were retold in Chapter IV in order to provide evidence of the various ways that the narrators aligned with moral perspectives in this study. Gilligan (1986b) described care and justice as "coordinates for mapping the moral domain." One can envision justice and

care as two different paths for negotiating relationships, and then extend the vision to include the participants of this study. The picture shows a group of people who for the most part are adept at taking either path, as well as plotting a course which combines both perspectives.

Examination of how narrators aligned with the two real-life narratives they told reveals that two narrators aligned with justice in both situations and three narrators aligned only with care. The remaining 11 participants demonstrated greater flexibility by aligning with both care and justice in both narratives (4), or having one combined and one justice (1), or one combined and one care (5), or one care and one justice (2). This showed a remarkable diversity in alignment among themselves and also flexibility in their own capacity to choose moral perspectives within their own specific conflict situations.

Jack and Jack's study (1989) described women attorneys choosing one of three strategies for use of the care perspective in their professional life: 1) some denied care altogether; 2) some split themselves in such a way that care was put in the background at work; and 3) a few reshaped their role so they could integrate care into their justice-oriented roles. Although the female student-services administrators have some things in common with female attorneys, especially when they perform as judicial officers, they neither deny care, nor put care on the back

burner, nor feel they have to reshape the role in order to include the care perspective. The student-services role does not require persons to be that radical in creating strategies to incorporate care into their work.

The majority of administrators in this study were educated in a field related to counseling. Assuming that their background qualified them at least in part for this administrative role, then selection of deans encourages the inclusion of persons with a care perspective. The position itself provides opportunities to use both care and justice and also to shift perspectives from one situation to another and also within the same situation. Those who come to the position already aligned with care may learn that the administrative aspects of their work require use of the justice perspective as well. Several participants described themselves "learning" on the job how to view things more from a perspective which honors fairness and consistency and justice.

> Being a counselor by training ... it was very difficult for me to adjust to the disciplinarian kind of role. As a counselor,...I could stay out of it because I got to counsel the students who got into trouble. To go from that counseling role to being the chief judicial advisor was a difficulty given my personality, which is to think the best of my students and to help them out and view them as victims of circumstance rather than as someone who just maliciously chose to do something. Mercy has always been a word in my vocabulary; now I've had to look at justice and fairness and consistency.

Question Four: Do women administrators change moral perspective by virtue of the context in which the conflicts occur?

A relationship between context and moral perspective became evident when narratives were compared on the basis of the relationships and roles which provided the framework for each narrative. Alignment with care was more evident in those situations where a colleague was one of the primary relationships described by the narrator and also when she was acting in her educator/advocate role. The justice perspective appeared more frequently in those situations in which she performed as judicial officer when compared with the total set of narratives.

These differences based on relationships and roles are consistent with the theory presented by Gilligan (1986b) that "the present remapping of development begins by differentiating two dimensions that characterize all human relationships: the dimension of inequality/equality and the dimension of attachment/detachment" (p. 48). One's relationship with colleagues is generally assumed to be one of equality based on attachment between persons. Responses within this framework generally call forth concerns related to the care perspective, i.e., a desire to support and maintain one's connection with the other and a fear of abandonment or disassociation with another. Relationships with colleagues were most often described within that per-

spective of care. In their role as educator/advocate, the participants aligned with care exclusively. Even though this role was described less often than their judicial and supervisory roles, it was a valued part of their job. Several expressed a strong commitment to protecting their relationship with students in terms of their advocacy role. "I am their advocate, I am here for them, I do value their involvement," responded a dean whose moral conflict revolved around her "taking that risk with students". That risk related to the possibility of her losing a good "working relationship" with the students by attending to the immediate concern of the institution for revised student policies without student input.

Another aspect of differences of perspective and context was seen with the 15 commentaries in response to a standardized student issue. When these were compared with the 31 real-life narratives, justice was more evident in the commentaries on all three dimensions: presence, predominance, and alignment. One explanation for the heavy emphasis on justice in the Wake Forest commentaries may be related to the differences in the way participants experienced self in the two kinds of conflicts. Gilligan (1982) and Lyons (1983) described two ways of experiencing self in relationship: as separate from others and as connected to others. "People who experience the self as predominantly separate tend to espouse a morality based on impersonal

procedures for establishing justice while people who experience the self as predominantly connected tend to espouse a morality based on care." (Lyons, 1983 cited in Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986, p. 102) The nature of the Wake Forest situation allowed the participants to posture a separate self since they were asked to act "as if" they were in the situation. The participants viewed the Wake Forest situation "from a distance" and therefore responded more with justice considerations. In the real-life narratives, they spoke about conflicts which they had experienced and even though these were told "from a distance" in time, participants were more connected to the experience by personal involvement, than they were in commenting on the more hypothetical one.

In other studies which use hypothetical dilemmas (Belenky et al., 1986), it has been found that women and girls do not score as high on justice and tend to pose questions which indicate "a sensitivity to situation and context" (p. 149). The standardized student issue used with participants in this study involved a situation with relationships, roles, and issues closely related to their own. Given that similarity, several deans still expressed their wish to know more about the situation than the news account provided. Their responses came after they had described in detail two of their own conflict situations. Perhaps one of the reasons the participants used more of the justice per-

spective was a need on their part to step outside of their own situations and to critique a problem which had taken place on a campus which they respected. Wake Forest utilized its honor code and judicial system to handle a problem which drew national attention. Two thirds of the participants basically agreed with how it was handled. Their agreement may have represented a vote for Wake Forest colleagues (a contextual consideration) rather than a vote for justice. One dean began her comments, "I have great empathy for our colleagues in situations like that and it also being on the front page of the newspaper!"

Implications for Administrative Practice

This study examined moral perspectives used by senior-level women administrators in dealing with conflict situations encountered in their work. As females, many of whom were trained in helping professions, the participants learned to develop their justice voice on the job. They showed an adeptness in their ability to incorporate justice and care into their thinking and decisions as senior-level administrators. There were also some examples of persons who were vulnerable to either care or justice; it appeared in those instances that one can get "stuck" and unable to act effectively by adhering either too closely with care or too rigidly with justice.

If both perspectives are needed for effective student services administration, then ideal administrative settings would include opportunities for persons to develop both justice and care. There would not be designated "good guys" who take care of students and "bad guys" who mete out justice. Care would not have to be seen in terms of "getting around the rules"; it is more than that. Staff meetings would provide opportunities for discussion about students' needs, as well as about how discipline problems were or could be handled. Supervisors would applaud the use of care as well as justice and assist newer staff members to develop both through orientation, supervision, ongoing training, and evaluation.

An examination of policies within institutions and departments is encouraged in an effort to insure that both justice and care considerations are included. Honor codes which focus on conduct and consequences need to be balanced with statements or creeds which express the values held in common by the community. Most important is the recognition by student-services administrators that there are no simple solutions to the complex human problems facing them; they need to bring different voices to the dialogue in order that the welfare and rights of all are served.

Implications for Preparation Programs

Preparation programs for administrators most often focus on knowledge base and procedural issues, i.e., what does one need to learn and know in order to become an administrator? The actual world of the administrator focuses on issues related to negotiating relationships in complex situations wherein the central question becomes: what are my responsibilities and rights to others and myself in this situation? Preparation programs need to assist people in that process of shifting from procedural thinking to constructive thinking. The world of administration is too full of contradictions and ambiguities to allow any pretense that there are actually "simple answers" to the questions raised and "one right way" to do things. Posing dilemmas and discussing real-life problems which require students to seek multiple perspectives is the challenge for preparation programs.

Administrators would benefit from knowing their preferred moral perspective and whether they tend generally to use one more than another in their thinking and decision making. This knowledge could be incorporated into preparation programs along with that related to leadership style and personality type. The knowledge of one's own perspective would be beneficial in helping an administrator to identify the different voices needed to achieve balance. Administrators also need to understand the ways people can

"get stuck" in either justice or care in order to recognize their own vulnerabilities and also to assist staff members who may also get stuck in either justice or care from time to time.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study, which examined how senior-level women administrators use care and justice in the construction, evaluation, and resolution of moral conflict, has implications for administrative practice and for preparation programs for student-services administrators. This was an exploratory study with a limited number of participants who work in institutions of a specific type (private four-year colleges) in one region of the United States (the Southeast); therefore, additional research is recommended.

Since the present study was exploratory, future investigations are critical. Comparisons might be made between educational administrators at different levels (new, mid-level, and senior) to test the relationship between moral perspective and experience. Administrators representing other aspects of the institution e.g., academic departments, enrollment services, residential life, special programs, etc. may reveal different moral perspectives in a study similar to this one. A comparative analysis of college policies for care and justice considerations would be useful to college administrators.

The relationship between context and moral perspective needs to be further explored through longitudinal studies to understand the patterns of moral perspective considering age, socio-economic background, number of years in administration, and highest degree earned. Aspects of organizational culture such as community values, different cultural settings, or size of institution need to be addressed in future studies related to moral perspective. These aspects of context (individual and group differences) were not examined in this study, although glimpses of possible connections were seen.

This study focused on senior-level women administrators in student-services departments serving undergraduate students. The number of women in administrative and leadership positions continues to increase within various American institutions: education, business, the military, church, and social services. Further research might explore the moral perspectives women use in other positions and make comparisons of females within and between groups. Comparative studies could also include males in similar positions in order to understand differences that may exist in the way men and women approach moral conflict.

Finally, the results of this study suggest that Gilligan's current moral development theory needs to be reformulated in a way which integrates the voices of both justice and care. Early theory traced the pattern of

development which occurs for males and culminates in a justice-centered approach; this pattern was then generalized to females. Gilligan and her colleagues have focused on tracing development which occurs for girls and women and have articulated the presence of a perspective or voice which centers around issues of care, connection, and relationship. The current theory does not dichotomize justice and care; however, those developing the theory have chosen to focus their studies on listening to the experiences of girls and women in order to reclaim and validate the care perspective. An integrative theory of moral development would assume both the presence and value of both care and justice and help us understand where and how the two paths intersect and unite.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Appleton, J., Briggs, C., & Rhatigan, J. (1978). Pieces of eight: The rites, roles, and styles of the dean by eight who have been there. Portland, OR: NASPA Institute of Research and Development.

Attanucci, J. (1988). In whose terms: A perspective on self, role, and relationship. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, & J. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. 201-223). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bardige, B., Ward, J., Gilligan, C., Taylor, J., & Cohen, G. (1988). Moral concerns and considerations of urban youth. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, & J. Taylor, (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. 159-173). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barr, M., Keating, L., & Associates. (1985). Developing effective student services programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, M. (1987). Individual and institutional integrity. NASPA Journal, 24(4), 2-5.

Beck, C. (1989). Is there really development? An Alternative Interpretation. Journal of Moral Education. 18 (3), 174-185.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. New York: Basic Books.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, L. (1989). Narratives of relationship: The development of a care voice in girls ages 7 to 16. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Brown, L., Argyris, D., Attanucci, J., Gilligan, C., Johnston, K., Miller, B., Osborne, R., Ward, J., Wiggins, G., & Wilcox, D. (1988). A guide to reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voice. Monograph. No.1. Harvard University, Graduate School of Education. Center for the Study of Gender, Education, and Human Development.

Brown, L., Tappan, M., Gilligan, C., Miller, B., & Argyris, D. (1989). Reading for self and moral voice: A method for interpreting narratives of real-life moral conflict and choice. In M. Packer & R. Addison (Eds.) Entering the circle: Hermeneutic investigation in psychology (pp. 141-164). Albany, NY: State University Press.

Brown, R. (1985). Creating an ethical community. In Canon & Brown (Eds.), Applied ethics in student services. (New Directions for Student Services, No. 30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Canon, H., & Brown, R. (Eds.). (1985). Applied ethics in student services. (New Directions in Student Services, No. 30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A., & associates (Eds.). (1981) The modern American college: Responding to the realities of diverse students and a changing society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chodorow, N. (1974). Family structure and feminine personality. In M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere, (Eds.), Woman, culture and society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1984) Invariant sequence and internal consistency in moral judgment stages. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz, Morality, moral behavior, and moral development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Conn, J. W. (1989) Spirituality and personal maturity. New York: Integration Books.

Delworth, U., Hanson, G., & associates. (1985). Student services: A handbook for the profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delworth, U., & Seeman, D. (1984). The ethics of care: Implications of Gilligan for the student services profession. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 489-492.

Dickey, B. & others. (1987). Gilligan revisited: Methodological issues in the study of gender and moral development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston. (ED 295 275).

Dinnerstein, D. (1976). The mermaid and the minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Farrago, J. (1983). My rights and your responsibilities: Moral discourse in higher education. In M. Baca & R. Stein (Eds.). Ethical principles, practices, and problems in higher education. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Farrant, P. (Ed.). (1986). Strategies and attitudes: Women in educational administration. Washington, DC: National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Gelwick, B. (1985). Cognitive development of women. In N. Evans (Ed.). Facilitating the development of women. (New Directions for Student Services, No. 29, pp. 29-44). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of the self and morality. Harvard Educational Review. 47. pp. 481-517.

Gilligan, C. (1981). Moral development in the college years. In A. Chickering and associates (Eds.). The modern American college: Responding to the realities of diverse students and a changing society (pp. 139-157). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1986a). Reply by Gilligan. In "On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 11 (2), 324-333.

Gilligan, C. (1986b). Remapping the moral domain: New images of the self in relationship. In T. C. Heller, M. Sosna, and D. E. Wellberry (Eds.). Restructuring individualism (pp. 237-252). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J., (1988). Two moral orientations: Gender differences and similarities. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 34 (3), 223-237.

Gilligan, C., Brown, L., & Rogers, A. (1989). Psyche embedded: A place for body, relationships, and culture

in personality theory. In A. Rabin (Ed.), Studying persons and lives. New York: Springer.

Gilligan, C., Johnston, D. K., & Miller, B. (1988). Moral voice, adolescent development, and secondary education: A study at the Green River School Monograph No. 3. Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Center for the Study of Gender, Education and Human Development.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N., & Hanmer, T. (Eds.). (1990). Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at the Emma Willard School. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Ward, J., & Taylor, J. (Eds.). (1989). Mapping the moral domain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodchild, L. F. (1987). Exploring the emerging field of ethics in higher education. Symposium presentation at meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, CA.

Greeno, C., & Maccoby, E. (1986). How different is the "Different Voice"? In "On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 11 (2), 310-316.

Harding, C. (1985). Moral dilemmas: Philosophical and psychological issues in the development of moral reasoning. Chicago: Precedent.

Haring-Hidore, M., Freeman, S., Phelps, S., Spann, N., & Wooten H. (1990). Women Administrators' Ways of Knowing. Education and Urban Society, 22 (2), 170-181.

Jack, D., & Jack, R. (1989). Women lawyers: Archetype and alternatives. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, & J. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. 263-288). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Johnston, D. K. (1985). Two moral orientations--Two problem-solving strategies: Adolescents' solutions to dilemmas in fables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Johnston, D. K. (1988). Adolescents' solutions to dilemmas in fables: Two moral orientations--Two problem-solving strategies. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, & J. Taylor (Eds.)

Mapping the moral domain. (pp. 49-72). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerber, L. (1986). Some cautionary words for historians. In "On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 11 (2), 304-310.

Knock, G. (1985). Development in student services in higher education. In Barr, Keating, & associates (Eds.), Developing effective student service programs (pp. 15-42). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). Essays on Moral Development: The psychology of moral development. Vol. II. New York: Harper and Row.

Kohlberg, L. (1982). A reply to Owen Flanagan and some comments on the Puka-Goodpaster exchange. Ethics, 92, 513-528.

Kohlberg, L. (1989). Resolving moral conflicts within the just community. In C. Harding (Ed.), Moral dilemmas (pp. 71-98). Chicago: Precedent.

Kohlberg, L. & Kramer, R., (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. Human Development, 12, 93-120.

Kurtines, W., & Gewirtz, J. (1984). Morality, moral behavior, and moral development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Langdale, C. J. (1983). Moral orientations and moral development: The analysis of care and justice reasoning across different dilemmas in females and males from childhood to adulthood. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

LeCompte, M., & Goetz, J. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 31-60.

Luria, Z. (1986). A methodological critique. In "On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 11 (2), 316-321.

Lyons, N.P. (1983). Two perspectives: On self, relationships, and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 125-145.

North Carolina College Student Personnel Directory: 1989-90. Raleigh: North Carolina College Personnel Association.

May, L. (1985). The moral adequacy of Kohlberg's moral development theory. In C. Harding (Ed.), Moral dilemmas (pp. 115-136). Chicago: Precedent.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Monat, W. (1985). Role of student services: A president's perspective. In Barr, Keating, & associates (Eds.), Developing effective student service programs (pp. 43-61). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1932)

Prose, F. (1990, January 7). Confident at 11, confused at 16. The New York Times Magazine. pp. 22-26, 38, 40, 45, 46.

Purpel, D. (1989). The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education. Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Rich, J., & DeVitis, J. (1985). Theories of moral development. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Rhodes, M. (1985, March/April). Gilligan's theory of moral development as applied to social work. Social Work, pp. 102-105.

Ricoeur, P. (1979). The model of a text: Meaningful action considered as a text. In P. Rabinow & W. Sullivan (Eds.), Interpretive social science: A reader. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sichel, B. (1985). Women's moral development in search of philosophical assumptions. Journal of Moral Education, 14 (3), 149-161.

Smith, R., Goodwin, E., Goslen, M., Hanna, P., Kivett, M., & Reece, L. (1989). Carol Gilligan's theory of moral development: A didactic seminar. Paper presented at annual meeting of National Council on Family Relations, New Orleans.

Stack, C. (1986). The culture of gender: Women and men of color. In "On In a different voice: An interdisciplinary forum." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 11 (2), 321-324.

Tinsley, A., Secor, C, & Kaplan, S. (Eds.). (1984). Women in higher education administration. (New Directions for Higher Education, No. 45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, L. (1984). Sex Differences in development of moral reasoning: A critical review. Child Development. 55 (3), pp. 667-691.

Ward, J. (1988). Urban Adolescents' Conceptions of Violence. In C. Gilligan, J. Ward, & J. Taylor, (Eds.) Mapping the moral domain. (175-200). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

APPENDIX A

Informed Consent

This study is concerned with conflicts that Deans of Students have in the administration of their responsibilities. It is being conducted by Jean Luce for her doctoral dissertation. You will be asked to describe two conflicts which will be tape recorded and transcribed. There is a data sheet which you will be asked to complete.

This study conforms to the Human Subjects Guidelines of the University of North Carolina Greensboro. Since the interview could entail discussion of sensitive matters or controversial issues, the information obtained in the study will be recorded and reported in such a manner that your identity will be protected. Each person will be assigned an identification number; only that number will appear on either the data sheet, the tape, or the transcription. Names of participants and college campuses will not be disclosed in the study. Once the transcription is complete and the committee has acknowledged this fact, the tapes will be erased.

Your participation in this project will greatly add to the knowledge about the administration of Student Services. There is no risk involved. You may withdraw from the study at any time after giving initial consent. You may request information about the results of the study when it is completed. If you have any questions about the study, please contact:

Jean Luce
1542 Spring Garden Street #16
Greensboro, NC 27403

Major Advisor: Dr. David H. Reilly, Professor
Department of Educational Administration
UNC Greensboro

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you may contact the Office of Research Services at UNC Greensboro (919) 334-5878.

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE EXPLANATION OF THE STUDY AND THE MEASURES TO ASSURE ANONYMITY AND I GIVE MY CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE.

Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX B

Personal Data Sheet

1. What is your current position? _____

2. How long have you been employed in your current position?_____years.

3. How would you describe your current institution?

   Private_____ Public_____ Coed_____ Single Sex_____

   Four-year_____ Two-year_____ Comprehensive _____

4. How many students currently attend your institution?

   under 600____ 600-1299____ 1300-2000____ over 2000___

5. What is your highest degree?_____

   Date degree awarded _____

6. How many total years have you worked in College Student Services?_____years.

7. How many different colleges have you worked?_____.

8. What is your age? under 30____ 30-39____ 40-49____

   50-59____ over 60____

9. Did the incidents described in this interview happen at the campus you are currently working? List approximate date (year only) of each incident.

   Incident #1: Yes_____ No_____ Approximate date _____

   Incident #2: Yes_____ No_____ Approximate date _____

10. Do you have any additional comments you would like to make related to the study or this interview?

APPENDIX C

Interview Format

I. Introduction

Purpose of interview and procedures

Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity

Informed Consent Form (read and sign)

II. Real Life Moral Conflict and Choice Interview*

Would you describe a situation which happened in your job as Dean of Students when you faced a conflict and had to make a decision, but weren't sure what to do.

1. What was the situation?

2. What was the conflict for you? Why was it a conflict?

3. In thinking about what to do, what did you consider? Why? Anything else you considered?

4. What did you decide to do? What happened?

5. Do you think it was the right thing to do? Why/why not?

6. What was at stake for you in this dilemma? What was at stake for others? In general, what was at stake?

7. How did you feel about it? How did you feel about it for the others involved?

8. Is there another way to see the problem (other than the way you described it)?

9. When you think back over the conflict, do you think you learned anything from it?

10. Do you consider the situation you described a moral problem? Why/why not?

11. What does morality mean to you? What makes something a moral problem for you?

Appendix C (cont'd)

III. Would you tell me about another situation in your job as Dean of Students where you had a conflict?

Repeat questions 1 through 11 listed above.

IV. Now I would like to describe an incident that really happened. You may remember; it was on national news and in the newspapers at the time. Read the following from the Winston-Salem Journal, November 28, 1989.

> The student at Wake Forest University who smuggled out television tapes of the shooting at Beijing's Tiananmen Square has been charged before the school's Honor Council with lying in order to go near the square. The charge against ..., a senior who expected to graduate last August, will be heard tonight. ...two professors who led a group of 28 students to China last spring, say that ... lied in telling them that he would not go to the square when he left the group's hotel on the outskirts of Beijing. "The basic charge is that we gave instructions to members of the group that they should not be going anywhere near the square. It turned out later that this one student did...told us that where he was going would not be near the square. The charge is that he told us one thing, then did something else.
>
> ... ended up watching the struggle the night of June 3 from a foreign correspondent's hotel room about three blocks from the square. Before the students left Beijing, an NBC News crew gave Bell tapes to take to Hong Kong. Those tapes were seen on a June 4 special report on the Beijing massacre. NBC officials later told him that 20 million ... saw that broadcast. (pp. 1 & 4)

What would you do or like to see happen if you were the Dean of Students in that situation?

Appendix C (cont'd)

V. Conclusion. Thank you for taking the time to talk with me so candidly today.

Assurances of confidentiality.

Leave copy of Informed Consent Form

*Brown, Lyn (Ed.). (1988). A guide to reading narratives of conflict and choice for self and moral voice. Cambridge, MA: Center for the Study of Gender, Education and Human Development, Harvard University.

Permission granted by Editor to use the method for this study.

APPENDIX D

Worksheets

Narrative#_____ Reader_____ Date_____

READING TO UNDERSTAND THE STORY (adapted from Reading Guide, 1988, pp. 162-163) The goal is to understand the context, the drama ... about morality and moral conflict.

A. Notes on the First Reading: Interpretation

Relationships

General moral language

Repeated words/themes

Contradictions

Key images/metaphors

B. Describe area of conflict: - what is the conflict about? (cite page/line numbers where found)

C. Summary Interpretation - Conflict

Appendix D (cont'd)

READING FOR SELF (adapted from Reading Guide, 1988, pp. 164-166) Underline in green pencil the narrator's representation of her self in the story of moral conflict.

A. What actions does self take in the conflict?

Does narrator describe a choice? What? How is it made?

What is narrator describing herself as saying and/or doing?

What is narrator thinking or considering or feeling?

B. Self in Relationship. What is the organizing frame for the relationship(s) described in the conflict? Explain.

inequality/equality_____
attachment/abandonment_____
both_____
neither_____

C. What does she describe as being at stake for herself in the conflict? (cite page/line #'s)

D. Summary Interpretation -- Reading for Self

Appendix D (cont'd)

READING FOR CARE (adapted from Reading Guide, 1988, pp. 167-169)
Underline in red key sentences which represent the presence of care i.e., concern for the good of others, alleviation of suffering, maintaining caring/connection in relationships.

A. Is the Care Orientation articulated?

page/line #'s	Interpretation

B. If not, what would constitute Care in this situation?

C. Does the Self align with Care? (How do you know?)

Explicit

Implicit

D. Summary Interpretation -- Self and Care Voice

Appendix D (cont'd)

READING FOR JUSTICE (adapted from Reading Guide, 1988, pp. 169-170). Underline in blue key sentences which represent the presence of justice i.e., concerns about reciprocity, objectivity, fairness, rules, and roles stemming from duties of obligation and commitment.

A. Is the Justice Orientation Articulated?

page/line #'s	Interpretation

B. If not, what would constitute Justice in this conflict?

C. Does the Self align with Justice? (How do you know?)

Explicit

Implicit

D. Summary Interpretation -- Self and Justice Voice

APPENDIX E

Summary Coding Questions

(Adapted from Reading Guide, 1988, pp. 171-173)

I. PRESENCE - The two moral orientations and how they are represented in this narrative (circle one):

1. Both justice and care are present.
2. Care is present in the narrative; justice is not.
3. Justice is present in the narrative; care is not.
4. Neither justice nor care is present; i.e., the narrative is "uncodable".

II. PREDOMINANCE - refers to which voice is most salient in the narrative (circle one):

1. The Justice voice predominates in the narrative.
2. The Care voice predominates in the narrative.
3. Both justice and care present, neither predominates.

III. ALIGNMENT - Does the narrative self express an "alignment" in the conflict? (consider whether or not the narrator comes down on one side of her own values.)
yes_____ no_____

1. Self aligns with Justice.
2. Self aligns with Care.
3. Self aligns with Both justice and care.
4. Self does not express an alignment with either voice (answer to the question is "no").

IV. Narrative Type for Incident

	#1	#2	#3
Both Justice and Care	_____	_____	_____
"Pure" Care	_____	_____	_____
"Pure" Justice	_____	_____	_____
Uncodable	_____	_____	_____

How does narrator define morality? (exact words)

Overall Summary Interpretation: How would you characterize the relationship between self and moral voice overall?